THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 12. MARCH 1932. Vol. XXI.

IN MEMORIAM

CHARLES ROBERT SHAW STEWART

MEMBERS of the Modern Churchmen's Union will remember Charles Robert Shaw Stewart mainly as a regular attendant, often as Chaplain, at our annual Conferences. We see him there—quiet, loyal, with native courtesy and charm, a gentle peacemaker, yet, as his more intimate friends knew, a stubborn, uncompromising believer. It was, if I may say so, the right kind of belief in two ways. (1) It was belief about the right things—at the centre, not on the fringe. It was belief in *God*. All else was approximate and subsidiary. The root of Christianity, for him, was this: *God* was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself; and from that root all the tree drew its sap. (2) But also, his belief itself, on the subjective side, was of a fine quality, impressively real. Newman elaborated the distinction between 'notional' and 'real' assent. We most of us, in a humble way, have noticed the difference between verbal and real belief. Verbal belief is fearfully plentiful, and useless; it is the mere breath of man, vanishing away like smoke or 'the trace of a cloud'; it, as a matter of fact, is *nothing*. Real belief is the breath of God, is the very breath of *life*; and its hope is full of immortality. The real believer brings us into *touch* with God. Shaw Stewart, though he would be the first to affirm his own sins and shortcomings, was a real believer. God had revealed Himself to him, and ever after, even when most hidden, God for him was there. Miss Hodgkin, the Quakeress, has told us how much moved she was in a cathedral in S. Italy by reading in great golden letters over the altar: DEUS ABSCONDITUS HEIC. I think we may say, I hope without exaggeration,

that through all the changing scenes of life Shaw Stewart saw invisibly written those words: 'God is hidden here.'

Our friend was a mystic. Mystics, as is well known, have often been expert and clever in practical matters. He was not, I think, such; not a clever administrator of affairs; but in affairs he was ardently interested—in the daily happenings and the common lot, in the national work, play, character. Again, the God of the mystics is sometimes thought to be serene, unconcerned, away from the rough and tumble of earth, its sins and abasements. Such was not God to Shaw Stewart. Our friend knew the struggle of a good man's life, its temptations, its penitence; and God for him, we may be sure, was not only the Author of Peace, but also the mighty Helper in time of need. 'O Lord God, thou strength of my health: thou hast covered my head in the day of battle.' Not, however, that the struggle is the chief thing to remember—not at all; the chief thing, far away, is this: That for many of us this friend of ours was, by the grace of God, one of the most beautiful Christian characters and one of the most saintly influences which we have known in our lives.

A few external matters should be noted. Shaw Stewart belonged to several other Liberal Church Societies: the C.C.C.; the London Society for theStudy of Religion; the little devotional clerical society named the Quiet XII, of which he was an original member thirty years ago; and the Committee for *A Declaration on Biblical Criticism*. He was also for some years Hon. Secretary of the Quest Society, and was a member of the Aristotelian Society. His outward clerical career was obscure. It began and ended in quiet parochial work, first as curate, then as rector. He was happy in his married life and in these secluded duties. We ought, I think, to note his distinguished birth. The Shaw Stewarts of Ardgowan are an ancient and eminent Scottish family, of which his father was the 7th Baronet. His mother was a daughter of the 2nd Marquess of Westminster. He was educated at Harrow and Christ Church. These things sat lightly upon him. I have heard him say (not word for word, but in effect): 'We must meet a man and take him exactly for what he is worth as a man, no more or less; altogether apart from his station or circumstances.' That is what he did; and we respected him for his chivalry and loved him for himself.

HUBERT HANDLEY.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Problem of Voluntary Euthanasia.

Problems of action, rather than problems of faith, are the live issues of to-day. The question what ought we to do troubles people far more than the question what ought we to believe. Yet in the ultimate resort, what we ought to do is determined by what we believe.

The problem of voluntary euthanasia is one of these practical problems. Many Christian people shrink from it just as their grandparents shrank from the use of anaesthetics. They felt that it was a rebellious and cowardly attempt to escape from the suffering which the Divine Father had, for all-sufficient but humanly inscrutable reasons, assigned to His child. The Saviour's example was cited for this attitude of courageous submission. He had refused the myrrhed wine: He had said, 'The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?'

Sir James Simpson used a Biblical argument to convince his religious opponents. Had not the Almighty Himself used the equivalent of chloroform in performing a surgical operation, when He caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, before He removed the rib to form Eve? What God had done, He had now given to man the power to do, and inasmuch as the imitation of God is the ideal of Christian Ethics, therefore Christian men may use anaesthetics. This argument convinced some whom, *mirabile dictu*, the terrible sufferings of patients undergoing surgical operations could not convince of the rightful use of anaesthetics.

The religious objections to voluntary euthanasia are very similar to those urged against the use of anaesthetics. Since life is the gift of God, the moral creature, however great his sufferings, has no right to terminate that life. He must wait until God gives him the *coup de grâce*. But is not the Divine action determined in this matter by the action of biological laws, and does not man's possession of rational and moral consciousness authorize him to control the biological world in harmony with his rational and moral consciousness? The rational and moral consciousness permits, nay, commends the man who terminates his

own life for patriotic, or humanitarian, or moral and religious reasons. The Christian world commended the action of Captain Oates when he walked out to meet death in an Antarctic blizzard. The voluntary termination of one's life is not necessarily wrong in itself. Indeed to terminate life under certain circumstances is regarded as supremely right. Christ terminated His life voluntarily when He resolved to proclaim His Messiahship in Jerusalem and to endure the Cross. The decision turns upon whether the reason for terminating a life is adequate. If the reason be adequate, the life may be rightly terminated.

To put animals to death painlessly when hopelessly injured or incurably diseased, is regarded as a humane duty.

If then a man be suffering from an agonizing, incurable, and fatal disease, *e.g.* cancer of the throat, may he not rightly terminate his life? The Christian Church has refused to sanction it. Yet the noblest of Pagan moralists, like 'our Seneca,' and Epictetus, regarded such action as noble. It testified to a manly resolution. It is of no little importance to note that Sir Thomas More, a man of sensitive Christian conscience, commended euthanasia under certain conditions. The mediating policy satirized in the modern version of the Sixth Commandment:

> 'Thou shalt not kill,
> But need'st not strive
> Officiously to keep alive,'

did not commend itself to More, as the following passage from *Utopia* shows:

> 'I have already told you with what care they look after the sick, so that nothing is left undone that can contribute either to their ease or health; and for those who are taken with fixed and incurable diseases, they use all possible ways to cherish them and to make their lives as comfortable as possible. They visit them often and take great pains to make their time pass off easily; but when any are taken with a torturing and lingering pain, so that there is no hope either of recovery or ease, the priests and magistrates come and exhort them, that, since they are now unable to go on with the business of life, are become a burden to themselves and to all about them, they should no longer nourish such a rooted distemper, but choose rather to die since they cannot live in such misery, being assured that if they thus deliver themselves from torture, or are willing that others should do it, they shall be happy after death: since, by their acting thus, they lose none of their pleasures, but only the troubles of life, they think they behave not only reasonably but in a manner consistent with religion and piety;

> because they follow the advice given them by their priests, who are the expounders of the will of God. Such as are wrought on by these persuasions either starve themselves of their own accord, or take opium, and by that means die without pain. But no man is forced on this way of ending his life; and if they cannot be persuaded to it, this does not induce them to fail in their attendance and care of them: but as they believe that a voluntary death, when it is chosen upon such an authority, is very honourable, so if any man takes away his own life without the approbation of the priests and the senate, they give him none of the honours of a decent funeral, but throw his body into a ditch.'

Dr. C. Killick Millard cites this passage from *Utopia* in his Presidential Address* delivered to the Society of Medical Officers of Health, in which he pleaded for 'the legislation of voluntary euthanasia under certain conditions,' and Sir Arbuthnot Lane writes a preface to it commending the proposal.

We are convinced that the Christian Church ought to reconsider its traditional attitude in this matter. The love of life is very strong; the power to hope against hope is equally strong; the shrinking from suicide is hardly less strong—all would combine to restrict the resort to legal voluntary euthanasia. Yet those who know what prolonged suffering can do to produce a mental breakdown which harrows the sufferer's nearest and dearest, and destroys the sufferer's powers of self-controlled endurance, will favour euthanasia. The anguish of watching helplessly the sufferings of those we love, is something which it is very hard to believe God wills. When the stage is reached expressed in Clutton Brock's poignant little verse:

> 'Now my body masters me,
> Nothing past its pains I see,'

we ought with the Stoics, who were neither cowardly nor irreligious, to recognize that it is the Divine Call to depart this life.

Among his supporters, Dr. Killick Millard cites Dr. Percy Dearmer and a clergyman with the very interesting and ancient designation, the (Rural) Dean of Christianity, as holding that euthanasia should be permitted.

Our Church authorities would do well to face the problem at an early date, and use the Power of the Keys, regardless of ecclesiastical tradition and fearless of Papal protests.

* Published by the C. W. Daniel Co., 46 Bernard Street, W.C.1. Price 1/- (1932).

The ROYAL SOCIETY AND RELIGIOUS FAITH.

Two hundred Fellows of the Royal Society, both British and foreign, have been requested by the Christian Evidence Society to answer a *questionnaire* dealing with religion. The answers of the scientists, tabulated, indexed, and in some cases abbreviated, have just been published in a volume entitled *The Religion of Scientists*.* The *questionnaire* consisted of the six following questions :

(1) Do you credit the existence of a spiritual domain?

(2) Do you consider that man is in some measure responsible for his acts of choice?

(3) Is it your opinion that belief in evolution is compatible with belief in a Creator?

(4) Do you think that science negatives the idea of a personal God as taught by Jesus Christ?

(5) Do you believe that the personalities of men or women exist after the death of their bodies?

(6) Do you think the recent remarkable developments of scientific thought are favourable to religious belief?

The tabulated answers give the following results :

	Yes.	*No.*	*Doubtful.*
Question (1)	121	13	66
,, (2)	173	7	20
,, (3)	142	6	52
,, (4)	26	103	71
,, (5)	47	41	112
,, (6)	74	27	99

Of course the point of view exhibited dominantly by the answers to question (3), although significant, are not at all new in the world of scientific thought. T. H. Huxley said many years ago :

> 'Physical science is no more atheistic than it is materialistic.'

And Martineau, the clear-headed expositor of the relations between science and religion in the classic days of their Victorian conflict, wrote :

> 'Evolution, whatever its extent, is not a Cause, nor even a Force, but a Method, which might be the path, either of a voluntary cause, or of a blind force, and has nothing to say to the controversy between them.'

The answers to question (3) indicate a growing tolerance on the part of scientists, and a clear recognition by them that the

* Edited by C. L. Drawbridge, pub. by Ernest Benn, price 2/6 (1932).

religious interpretation of the Universe is permissible—let us say intellectually respectable. The proportion who take this view is roughly 24 to 1.

The answers to question (4), 'Do you think that science negatives the idea of personal faith in God as taught by Jesus Christ?' are no less significant. Although their affirmations are roughly 4 to 1, and the doubtful nearly 3 to 1, yet the fact that only one in eight of the Fellows of the Royal Society feels able to reply in the negative, indicates not merely the caution of the man of science, which restrains him from the temptation to draw inferences outside his sphere, but also the readiness to recognize that there are spheres of reality which science is not competent to investigate scientifically, and in regard to which the man of science can make no dogmatic pronouncements. This is a great change from the dominant note of nineteenth century science which was depressingly materialistic. Now its tendency is mystical and it inclines towards a spiritual or a metaphysical interpretation of the Universe. We may thank the philosophers rather than the theologians for this victory of truth. It was James Ward and A. J. Balfour who knocked the bottom out of scientific materialism in this country. A Professor of Physiology, cited in *The Religion of the Scientists*, sums up the situation thus :

> 'Twenty-five years ago, physical scientists tended to be materialists, and the biologists followed them. At present they tend to be mystics, while many biologists — particularly in America — tend to lag behind them, and to retain a materialistic outlook. There is a strong feeling, now growing up among biologists, against any excessive mechanistic interpretation of life (in its widest sense) — the offensive attitude of complete materialism is largely a consequence of and a result from religious intolerance of scientific beliefs, and, once religious intolerance ceases, scientific men will become more tolerant of and friendly to the religious outlook.'

While scientists as a body are to-day less dogmatic, intolerant, and materialistic, they have become more impatient of these weaknesses in the ecclesiastical world. A number of answers in the *questionnaire* indicate this. For instance, Professor J. S. Haldane, philosopher as well as scientist, speaks of traditional religious beliefs as being 'permeated to a very great extent with materialism.'

The editor of *The Religion of Scientists* thus sums up the attitude of men of science to contemporary religion :

'Many scientists are critical of theological creeds. The man of science, as such, is not expected to subscribe to any particular *scientific creed,* but aims at maintaining (and is expected to maintain) an open mind, to some extent, with a view to developing and changing his beliefs as his studies advance. He aims at being modernist rather than conservative. . . . Many scientists have an idea that ecclesiastically-minded religious people, on the contrary, are more dogmatic than teachable. That they are afraid of revolutionary theological ideas and discourage freedom of investigation in the sphere of theology, and thus close their minds to further enlightenment. The point of these men of science is that, if the theological conclusions are all prescribed at the outset, all progressive discovery of the truth is precluded from the commencement' (p. 143).

From this it is clear that if scientists are to become professing and practising Christians, they must needs be Modernists.

Dr. Henson and Catholic Patois.

Dr. Henson's Advent Charge to the ordination candidates of the Durham Diocese is published in *The Bishoprick* of February, 1932. It is, to use Chaucer's phrase, 'sownynge in moral manere.' The pity is that it should be necessary for a Bishop to deal with such obvious duties as the obligation of clergymen to be punctual and business-like, to keep out of debt, and to see that their gardens and houses are well kept. Under the heading 'The Duty of being Intelligible,' the Bishop condemns the use of Roman Catholic terminology by the clergy. He writes:

'Not infrequently I receive angrily expressed protests against the use by parish clergy of language which is unusual, suggestive, and exasperating, and which seems to have no practical recommendation whatever. It is charitable to suppose that the clergy who give this gratuitous offence do so intentionally, and almost unconsciously. They repeat the phrases with which they have been familiar at their Theological College, or are accustomed to read in some partisan newspaper, or to hear at meetings of partisan societies. "Mass," "Requiem," "Shrift," etc., have come to be natural enough to themselves, and they never pause to consider how very far from natural they must certainly appear to their parishioners. You will notice that this is a matter which lies outside the Law, and therefore outside the Bishop's control. I can but point out the inexpediency, unfairness, and uncharity involved in action which must perplex, and may even distress and alienate, the very people to whom the clergyman has been commissioned for the purpose of helping them in the difficult venture of the Christian life, and whom he cannot help at all if they regard him with doubt and apprehension. Why, it will be inevitably asked, should my parson use the distinctive language of the Church of Rome, if he be really loyal to the Church of England? This language is not found in the Prayer Book, whether Caroline or Georgian: it is absent from

> the Thirty-nine Articles, from the official pronouncements of the Bishops, from the Canons of Convocation, from the writings of the leading Anglican Divines from the sixteenth century to the twentieth. Who can blame the ordinary parishioner for feeling perturbed and suspicious when he hears the long discarded terms on the lips of the newly instituted incumbent or the newly licensed curate? In fact, an initial prejudice is created which will only be overcome, if overcome at all, very gradually.'

Of course, some of the clergy who so offend are unconscious of the offence they are giving, and we may assume that none are moved by the desire to give offence. The use of such terminology is one of the marks of a 'Catholic'—a clergyman who really knows what is what in the Catholic Church of which he is a priest. He is no narrow nationalist. He, as a Catholic, uses the ancient Catholic phraseology rather than a later nationalist vocabulary. The Reformation asserted the rights of National Churches, as it did the rights of Christian States, against Papal Imperialism, but our clergyman knows nothing of Papal Imperialism; what he visualizes is Catholic Internationalism, and in the light of that vision, nationality and nationalism, national Churches and their national Church ways, are nothing to him. The laity may be annoyed, but that is merely due to their ignorance. The Bishop may protest, but that is due either to his timidity or to his prejudice.

It is hard to know how to deal with this practice. It is another illustration of Aristotle's profound axiom: 'Men differ about small things, but the reasons for their differences are never small.' If ordinands are trained on Anglo-Catholic lines they must almost of necessity adopt the Papal *patois*. The remedy must go as deep down as the cause of the evil, but such remedies make a heavy demand on pocket and patience.

Rationalists and Modernists.

The Literary Guide of March, 1932, publishes an article inviting Rationalists and Freethinkers to take a more friendly and understanding view of Modernists as men who are as strongly opposed to superstition, obscurantism and fanaticism in religion as are the Rationalists themselves. The Rev. J. C. Hardwick, the author of the appeal, tells them that they cannot reform the Christian Church from the outside: beneficial reforms can only be effected from within.

Mr. Hardwick's invitation is trenchantly dealt with by 'Robert Arch' in a parallel column in the same issue. The Rationalist critic holds that Modernists are attempting the impossible. He writes:

> 'Once more men of culture, emotionally wedded to ancestral rites and myths, plead with the assailants to stay their destructive hand—not to criticize "from without," but to come inside and reform the old religion "from within." What shall we say? *Mutatis mutandis*, I think we shall say what the Christian Fathers said to the Neo-Platonists—namely, that the old religion is so radically bad as to be past reforming. To them Paganism was demon-worship, and compromise with it was impossible. To us Christianity is the creed which the wide world over is helping to keep the poor and ignorant contented with their poverty and ignorance; it is synonymous with other-worldliness; it is the opium of the people, and compromise with it is impossible.
>
> 'We are invited to help in "liberalizing it from within." Our answer is that it cannot be liberalized from within. Men like Mr. Hardwick, Bishop Barnes, and Dr. Major are totally unrepresentative of the Church to which they belong. The forces of darkness, the Anglo-Catholics, the men who fight birth-control and divorce-law reform, the men who stand for squalor and unhappiness, outnumber them by ten to one, and can vote them down in Convocation every time and all the time. Even if by a miracle the Modernists could capture the Church of England it would be useless. A huge host of medievalists would secede on the spot; the captors would be left triumphing over an empty husk; and Rome would be the sole gainer.'

We cannot predict the future, but we can investigate the present and interpret it correctly. The Anglo-Catholics may outnumber the Modernists among the clergy 'by ten to one,' but although Napoleon took the view that 'God is on the side of the big battalions,' History does not support that axiom. Lowell's verdict can be shown to be more accurate: 'To be but one, but to be with God, is to be in the majority.' The numbers of professed Modernists is certainly not large, nor is it likely to become so, but Modernism is penetrating all schools in the Church of England. Fr. Ronald Knox in his recent controversy with Mr. Arnold Lunn gave deep offence to the *Church Times* by asserting that Anglo-Catholicism is 'simply crawling with Modernism.' Without assenting to the form of this charge, we believe that it is true in substance. All the really influential Anglo-Catholic teachers to-day are showing increasingly the influence of Modernism. It is true that in certain cases they protest against or criticize Modernism, but that is merely an example of straining at a gnat by the man who has swallowed a camel.

The Modernist Anglo-Catholic is to be detected by his methods of thought and by his orientation rather than by his conclusions on disputed points.

The penetration of Evangelicalism by Modernism, under the leadership of Archdeacon Storr, is even more apparent to students of our Church life.

No careful reader of English Roman Catholic religious writing, intended to influence educated English people, who are not Roman Catholics, can fail to detect the influence of Modernism. Although the Papal authorities show no traces of Modernism, either in their policy or pronouncements, yet we are convinced that even Romanism, if it is to hold its own amid the rising tide of modern education, must become Modernist.

Modernism takes the middle path between secularism and superstition: it believes in reason and it believes in religion, and it is convinced, that in the union of both, the highest good is secured. When reason is religious, and religion is reasonable, human life is unified and the conditions of true social progress secured. Secularism lacks the salt which counteracts corruption. The materialism on which it builds is a most insecure foundation. A religion which is obscurantist and intolerant, though it be a better basis for a civilization than is secularism, is yet almost equally unsatisfactory. We could wish the secularist would realize that what our civilization needs is a rational, moral and spiritual religion.

Furthermore, the Rationalist Press critic jibes at Modernism as Neo-Unitarianism. The Modernist is no more and no less a Neo-Unitarian than he is a Neo-Catholic and a Neo-Evangelical, and possibly even a Neo-Rationalist also. He believes that mankind cannot fulfil its ideal without religion; on the other hand, religion needs to develop, and in its progress to purge out all that is materialist, superstitious, obscurantist, immoral and fanatical—in other words, become increasingly loyal to the principles of Christ.

The Two-facedness of the English Church.

Dr. Headlam's speech at the close of the Spring Session of the Church Assembly struck two notes which are apt to be drowned by the clamour of our internal conflicts. (1) The com-

prehensive, many-sided character of the Church of England which distinguishes her from all continental Churches and is the main cause of the strong interest of those Churches in her. (2) The need for closing up the Christian ranks in the face of the great dangers which beset Christianity to-day, especially in Europe. In the latter part of his speech, as reported in the *Times* of February 6th, Dr. Headlam said :

> 'It had been suggested that the Church of England presented one front to the Orthodox Church and another front to the Protestant Churches on the Continent. He believed that the representatives of both Churches knew quite well what the Church of England was like. Certainly in all the negotiations he had been privileged to carry on he had emphasized the comprehensiveness of the Church of England and of the different parties in it, and he had definitely stated that he believed this to be a strength and not a weakness in the Church of England. It was true that on the Continent they were sometimes a little puzzled. The Church of England was a difficult body to understand, but the fact remained that they did know that we tried to comprehend different types of Christianity in one united society. It was the fact that we combined the Evangelical and the historical traditions of Christianity which made our Church so interesting to Churches abroad. The old separation of Churches had broken down, and there was far greater friendliness and a far greater desire for unity. A dignitary on the Continent had told him (the Bishop) that, in view of the anti-religious propaganda now rife, the dangers to Christianity were greater than at any time since the first rise of Mohammedanism, and that the only thing that would enable them to stand up against this anti-religious propaganda would be a united Christian Church.'

Father Woodlock, the Jesuit controversialist, has publicly made this charge of two-facedness against the English Church in her reunion negotiations, and not without evidence, but no one would dream of making such a charge against Dr. Headlam, who has never shown any lack of either candour or courage in his reunion utterances and policy. The English Church is in many respects typical of the English people. It is illogical but reasonable, idealist but practical, fallible but inspired, enterprising but cautious, possessing an influential episcopate but subject to State control which preserves the Church's historic comprehensiveness and tolerant temper, interior freedom, and national character.

Englishmen when reading their Church news are more impressed by 'our unhappy divisions' than are discerning continental ecclesiastics. We remember being interviewed by two distinguished Roman-Catholic clergymen who had already in-

terviewed a number of well-known Anglo-Catholic and Evangelical Churchmen. In reply to the question as to what impressions these interviews had created in their minds, they stated that they found the Church of England much more united than they had supposed. It seemed to them that the agreement was much deeper than the differences. The Church of England includes among her members and officials every type of Churchmanship short of avowed Unitarianism on the one side and avowed Roman Catholicism on the other. She is as varied in colour as a Persian rug and as tough in texture.

The dangers with which continental Christianity is faced to-day are mainly of its own creating. It has been either indifferent or hostile to the intellectual and moral situation, produced by the changing and distinctly puzzling environment of the modern spirit. European Romanism, Orthodoxy, and Protestantism, should they unite against Secularism, will not be able to check its menacing advance unless they unite on a basis of truth, love, and freedom, and courageously jettison all in their existing systems which is hostile to these primary fundamentals of Christ's religion. Reunion without tears means reunion without potency. It is obscurantism and superstition, the intolerance and *intransigeance* of continental Christianity which keep that Christianity divided and are also the very things which render it incapable of resisting Secularism successfully. Traditionalist Protestantism is no more capable of making converts in Spain to-day than is Romanism. Traditional dogmatic Christianity is in urgent need of a new presentation, but how to secure agreement with regard to this new presentation is the problem, upon the solution of which Christianity must be agreed before it can become effectively united and be sufficiently potent, not only to check, but also to vanquish Secularism. As yet, organized continental Christianity does not seem to be really facing this fundamental task.

The Birmingham Deadlock.

The following paragraph which appeared in the *Church of England Newspaper* indicates clearly that the Birmingham conflict must continue until discipline is restored in the diocese :

> ' It is now possible to disclose that a sincere effort has been made to

end the unfortunate position in the Birmingham Diocese, where some thirteen incumbents have banded together in a refusal to obey the Bishop's injunctions to cease the practice of open reservation of the consecrated elements. Unhappily, it has to be reported, for the time at least, that the position remains one of deadlock, and there seems little hope that a settlement can be reached.

'The "peace" efforts followed on the appeal made by Canon G. E. Badger at the last Diocesan Conference. Impressed by the amount of support he received, the Canon gathered a body of leading clergy of the Liberal Evangelical or Central school of thought, and it was arranged to meet the Anglo-Catholic group. The meetings held were marked by a frank and friendly interchange of views, which certainly helped to clear the issue in the minds of all present. The Anglo-Catholic group expressed a willingness, though with reluctance, to abandon extra-liturgical services, such as Benediction, Exposition, etc., but remained adamant on the question of their continuance of Reservation in the open church.

'The group of "mediators" then arranged an interview with the Bishop, and the results of these discussions were submitted to Dr. Barnes. The Bishop, while naturally sympathetic towards the desire for the restoration of unity in the diocese, remains firm on the question of obedience to his injunctions. His position is clear and definite. When he was appointed to the diocese in 1925 the Prayer Book discussions were still proceeding. He did not, therefore, attempt to enforce what he regards as the regulations of the 1662 Book. He stated he would "raise no objection" to Reservation provided it was for the sick only, and that the reserved elements were kept in a locked chapel, or otherwise removed from the area of worship.

'In the case of those who were in the diocese at the time, the Bishop will raise no objection to the continuance of the practice as then allowed. Newcomers to the diocese must, however, undertake that there shall be no perpetual reservation at all in their churches.

'A group of leading laity in the diocese, led by Sir Charles Grant Robertson, Principal of Birmingham University, also made a simultaneous effort at mediation, but they came up against the same adamant refusal of the Anglo-Catholic group to compromise on the question of Reservation for the purpose of adoration, and in consequence their interview with the Bishop proved fruitless. It is unfortunately plain that the breach cannot be healed at present.'

This conclusion is a disappointing one for ecclesiastical pacifists who felt negotiations conducted in a conciliatory atmosphere would end the conflict. The combatants represent mediaeval scholasticism and modern science respectively, and the higher synthesis is not yet within sight. Lubrication can no more achieve peace than can denunciations of ecclesiastical strife. The war must continue until discipline is restored or the Church of England accepts a *cultus* which was deliberately rejected after tremendous conflict at the Reformation.

THE PRESENT POSITION WITH REGARD TO THE FOURTH GOSPEL

By the Venerable Archdeacon Hunkin, D.D., M.C., O.B.E.,
Chaplain to H.M. the King.

THE volume of work put out by New Testament scholars is so great that most of us are very grateful to those who from time to time help us to take a bird's eye view of it. It was in 1905 that the late Professor Sanday published the valuable survey which he entitled *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*. This was followed in the next year by Dr. H. Latimer Jackson's *The Fourth Gospel and Some Recent German Criticism* (1906). In 1918 appeared a second volume by Dr. Latimer Jackson under the title *The Problem of the Fourth Gospel*. Dr. Jackson had kept in touch with the work that had been going on, and particularly with the German work. Then in 1920 Professor V. H. Stanton published the third part of his comprehensive studies of *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, and this part, which was devoted to the Fourth Gospel, included a review of the Criticism of the previous thirty years. And now we have the Fernley Lecture for last year by Dr. W. F. Howard, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*.

Dr. Howard has been very painstaking and he has missed very little. His survey, indeed, is the fullest that has yet appeared. He has been able to take account of the latest contributions to the Mandaean question such as H. Lietzmann's *Ein Beitrag zur Mandäerfrage* (1930). He has not overlooked studies which, while not dealing directly with the Fourth Gospel, have an important bearing on the subject, as for example Professor Gerhard Kittel's *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum* (1926); and in passing we note that he has duly observed Dr. Kittel's commendation of Adolf Schlatter's valuable, but rather neglected, work of nearly thirty years ago, *Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten* (1902). No English translation of Dr. Schweitzer's most recent book, *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus* (1930), had yet appeared when Dr. Howard's lectures went to the press, and

his summary of it is still welcome and useful although the excellent version of Mr. Montgomery has since been issued.

The only omissions I have noted are of works dealing with some special theme, *e.g.* Krebs, *Der Logos als Heiland im ersten Jahrhundert*, and Hans Leisegang, *Der heilige Geist* (1919); and of shorter papers, as for instance Professor G. F. Moore's important essay on *Intermediaries in Jewish Theology* in the *Harvard Theological Review*[1] for January, 1922, and Professor J. M. Creed's illuminating article on *Sacraments in the Fourth Gospel* in the *Modern Churchman* (October, 1926).

Omissions of this kind must not of course be accounted a serious blemish in such a brief survey as that which alone Dr. Howard could give within the limits which he had set himself. On the other hand, either of these two essays deserves more attention than the work of Dr. Vacher Burch, to which Dr. Howard gives uncalled for prominence (pp. 62, 63, and 155, 156). In other places, too, we seem to be conscious of an occasional lack of discrimination. It is not always easy to distinguish from Dr. Howard's pages which contributions are really important and which are not. It would be difficult, I think, to gather from his account what an outstanding work Professor Stanton's is; or how valuable for linguistic and detailed comment is Dr. Bernard's Commentary in the International Critical series; and though the impression made in this country by Dr. E. F. Scott's work on the Gospel is recorded (p. 37), it hardly receives the recognition which is its due.[2]

One other slight criticism may perhaps be permitted here. In his *Historical Survey* Dr. Howard has followed the example, the bad example as it seems to me, of Foakes Jackson and Lake in their edition of the *Acts*, and has separated the various countries, treating successively of Britain and America, Germany and France. Scholarship is, and must be, international, and although we may be conscious of a certain degree of British isolation, yet the investigations which have proceeded in this country have so many connexions and inter-connexions with those which have taken place abroad that territorial divisions in a survey of the work done are distinctly inconvenient.

[1] See also F. C. Burkitt in *J.Th.S.*, 1922-1923, pp. 158, 159.

[2] And there might, with great advantage, have been some reference to Dr. W. Lock's penetrating review of it (*J.Th.S.*, April, 1908).

After his historical survey in Part I, Dr. Howard goes on in Parts II and III to sum up the results of the work hitherto surveyed and in certain directions to carry the investigation a little further.

The first chapter of Part II is entitled *The Unity of the Gospel and its Relation to the Johannine Writings*. Dr. Howard begins by pointing out how different are the results obtained by the various scholars who have tried to analyse the Gospel into separate sources. He refers to the work of Spitta and Wendt, Schwartz and Wellhausen and B. W. Bacon. None of these scholars has applied the test of lexical and grammatical usage to any appreciable extent. The test, so far as it goes, is decisively in favour both of the substantial unity of the Gospel itself and also of the common authorship of the Gospel and the three Johannine Epistles. Dr. Charles has shown that linguistically II and III *John* are to be classed with I *John* rather than with the Apocalypse; and most scholars now assign I *John* to the author of the Fourth Gospel. On this latter point Stanton agrees with Brooke and Bernard. His contention that II and III *John* do not contain enough allusion to 'the deeper experiences of the Christian life' for them to be by the same author as I *John* and the Gospel has always seemed to me to make too great a demand on little letters which might each cover but a single sheet of papyrus. Even an Apostle might be excused from not treating of the deeper experiences of the Christian life in every one of the brief notes or dispatches which he threw off in the ordinary course of his Church administration, and which perhaps occupied in their composition but a few moments of his time.[3] Dr. Howard's own study (and here he is working in a field where he has had great experience) tends to confirm the impression that all four documents are by the same hand. A further question, subsidiary but interesting, is the question whether Chapter xxi of the Gospel is an appendix written by the author of the first twenty chapters or by someone else. Dr. Howard asserts that the linguistic study of which he gives us a summary in Appendix B has 'to his surprise' led him to change his former belief that the Appendix came from a hand different

[3] G. G. Findlay, *Fellowship in the Life Eternal* (1909), p. 3. They contain less than three hundred words apiece in the Greek.

from that which wrote the rest of the Gospel. It may be noted also that a recent essay by Dom J. Chapman (*J.Th.S.*, July, 1930) is in favour of the conclusion that the whole of Chapter xxi, including even vv. 24 and 25, is to be attributed to the Evangelist himself and not to an interpolator.

To sum up, then, so far: there seems to be general agreement that the Gospel and I *John* are by the same author, and recently there has been a tendency to assign II and III *John* to the same person. As to the Appendix (Chapter xxi), it is now coming to be realized that there is more to be said for attributing it to the Evangelist himself than has been commonly thought.

But without attempting to decide these questions let us pass on to a more important problem — the problem which is concerned with the character and purpose, the habitat and message, of the Fourth Gospel, bearing in mind that I *John* is closely, and II and III *John* are also in some way, attached to it. Happily scholars are here coming to a considerable measure of agreement.

If we ask the question where is there to be found other literature which moves in the same circle of ideas, we find the answer, in the first place, in the writings of Ignatius of Antioch. His epistles are strewn with Johannine phrases. Examples are: 'living water,' 'the prince of this world'; references to the 'Bread of God,' 'the flesh of Jesus Christ,' to Christ as 'the *logos* of God'; while in such a sentence as 'the spirit is not deceived being from God, for it knoweth whence it cometh and whither it goeth' (*Phil.* vii) we seem to hear an echo of Johannine language (*Jn.* viii, 14; iii, 8). It is not indeed possible to demonstrate that Ignatius actually used the Fourth Gospel, but Dr. Sanday was not putting the matter too strongly when he said that Ignatius 'reflects Johannine teaching with extraordinary fidelity.'

Here then we find for the Gospel a real point of attachment in place and time: for it is not seriously disputed that the Epistles of Ignatius are to be associated with Asia Minor in the second decade of the second century. In Asia Minor at the turn of the first century we are brought face to face with the situation presupposed by the Johannine literature. A rising Gnosticism is tending to evacuate the Christian Gospel of its historical

content, and to loosen the corporate unity of the Church. The Church itself needs to have its conception of the sacraments deepened and spiritualized. A subordinate difficulty brought out, not so much in the Epistles of Ignatius as elsewhere (*e.g.* in the account of the Martyrdom of Polycarp), is the persistent hostility of the Jews. And there are others, *e.g.* the existence of a circle which tended to exalt John the Baptist into a position of undue prominence.[4]

In order, then, to come to grips with the main problems presented by the Johannine literature, we must place ourselves in Asia Minor at the turn of the first century A.D. That may now, I think, be taken as an agreed starting point for more detailed investigation. If so, we may assume that the Synoptic tradition is well known both to the writer and to his readers, and we can readily understand that the Evangelist's purpose is to reinterpret the facts of the life and the teaching of the Lord 'in the retrospect of an enlightened faith.'

> 'What first were guessed as points, I now knew stars,
> And named them in the Gospel I have writ.'[5]

The Evangelist is well aware of the ordinary Christian view, *e.g.* as to the Sacraments and the Parousia, and does not quarrel with it. Thus he himself repeats the current language about 'eating the flesh' and 'drinking the blood' of Christ; but he does so in order to help his readers to a more deeply spiritual experience. The Parousia is never denied, but it is allowed to fade into the background as compared with the conception, at once more profound and more practical, of Eternal Life as something entered into here and now.

It can hardly be questioned that the Prologue gives the key to the whole Gospel. Nor, I think, can there be any doubt that the ideas connoted by the term *Logos* are substantially those which we find in Philo and that they belong to the general Hellenistic thought of the time. Here again the Evangelist seems to have started from the older Christology, traces of which are not altogether eliminated from his thought. Thus at the Baptism, John the Baptist 'bore witness, saying, I have beheld the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven; and *it abode*

[4] *Acts* xix. Note also the Judaising Docetism aimed at, *e.g. Smyr,* ii and v.

[5] Browning, *A Death in the Desert.*

upon him' (i, 32). But the Evangelist is able to absorb the primitive conception into one more consonant with the best Hellenistic thought of the time.

Looking back upon the life of Jesus, we see him as the Logos incarnate. 'The word became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, glory as *of the only begotten from the Father*) full of grace and truth.' Professor Stanton and others have remarked on the absence of the doctrine of the Logos from the rest of the Gospel, but in point of fact it lies close behind the narrative throughout. We might perhaps have expected it to be referred to again explicitly in xx, 31, 'these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name.' But arguments from silence are notoriously precarious. And though the word *Logos* is not mentioned, we have such expressions as:

> 'The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand' (iii, 35).
>
> 'Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he came forth from God, and goeth unto God . . .' (xiii, 3).

Further, if we examine the Johannine conception of the Person of Christ a little more closely, we find that it appears to have been arrived at by taking the Pauline idea of the *Spirit of Christ* and bringing it into relation with the Hellenistic notion of the *Logos*.

Philo seems rather to avoid the term πνεῦμα. He was trying to write Platonic Greek, and the word πνεῦμα was not used by the Greeks for 'mind.' Nevertheless it would be in accordance with Stoic thought to say, roughly speaking, that the *Logos* was in its nature and substance πνεῦμα.

The *Logos*, the Prologue says, was God: God is spirit, says the fourth chapter. It would follow that the *Logos* is spirit: and in accordance with this the third chapter asserts that Jesus was in possession of the plenitude of the spirit, while in the sixth chapter we read, '*The words that I have spoken unto you are spirit*' (vi, 63). Similarly, those in Old Testament times to whom the word of God came were called gods (*Jn.* x, 35): rightly so, for the word is spirit-bearing, and they became partakers of the divine nature.

When Jesus passed into His 'higher unrestricted life' there

was a great liberation of spirit available for the Christian community. Before Jesus was glorified (vii, 39) there was not that source to draw upon. There is a fine passage in John Masefield's *Trial of Jesus* where Procula, Pilate's wife, interviews Longinus, the centurion in charge of the Crucifixion. The centurion has just described the bodily collapse of Jesus.

> *Procula*: 'Do you think he is dead?'
> *Longinus*: 'No, lady, I don't.'
> *Procula*: 'Then where is he?'
> *Longinus*: 'Let loose in the world, lady, where neither Roman nor Jew can stop his truth.'

Mr. Masefield certainly catches an early Christian belief. The glorification of Jesus meant the liberation of the divine spirit. The Evangelist locates this liberation where he had actually experienced it—in the Church. So the risen Christ breathes on His assembled followers and says, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost . . .' (xx, 22). Previously, in the Upper Room, He had said, 'I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may be with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth: whom the world cannot receive, for it beholdeth him not, neither knoweth him' (xiv, 16, 17). This Paraclete is not to be called the *Logos*, but the Logos is spirit and the Paraclete is spirit. And through the Church the Paraclete will affect the surrounding world.

> 'He (the Paraclete), when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. . . .
> 'He shall guide you into all the truth; for he shall not speak from himself; but what things soever he shall hear, these shall he speak. . .
> 'He shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you' (xvi, 8*ff*).

We almost hear the echo of St. Paul's 'Who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man, which is in him? Even so the things of God none knoweth, save the Spirit of God. But we received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God' (I *Cor.* ii, 11, 12).

The author of the Fourth Gospel is certainly a mystic. He has had the personal experience of Christ dwelling in him by spiritual in-dwelling: and in his writings he attempts to relate his Christian experience to the best philosophy of his time. He sees in the life of the Spirit the key to the riddle of existence. His philosophy is not worked out with complete consistency—whose philosophy ever is?

It is further to be noted that if the Evangelist had used less positive and glowing language about the Lord, he would have been saying less than the Asiatic Greeks said of Caesar. The town-council of Ephesus had placed on an aqueduct an inscription in honour of Julius Caesar in which he is described as 'the God made manifest,' and 'the universal Saviour of human society' (C.I.G. 2957). The Evangelist can surely be excused for employing the title ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου though he introduces it in a context where its use could hardly be strictly historical (*Jn.* iv, 42). The inscriptions from Halicarnassus and Priene dated about 9 B.C., celebrating the birthday of Augustus on 23rd September, are equally striking: 'The birthday of the god is become the beginning of *euangelia* through him to the world. . .' He is 'god out of god' and 'Zeus out of Father Zeus.'[6]

The general conception of the *Logos* which is in question here is certainly not rabbinic. As Dr. G. F. Moore has shown in the paper which I have already mentioned, it is not derived from the Targumists. All the Targumists do by the use of the word *Memra* is to avoid anthropomorphic expressions. *Memra* is not a *being* of any kind or in any sense, whether conceived personally as an angel employed in communication with men, or as a philosophically impersonal created potency. It is merely a *buffer-word*, a phenomenon of translation, not a creature of speculation. The Johannine conception of the *Logos* belongs not to rabbinic Judaism but to Hellenistic philosophy.

On the other hand, there is much in the Fourth Gospel which suggests a close connexion with Palestine. In 1912 Adolf Schlatter collected a great deal of material from rabbinic literature which showed how the phraseology of the Gospel can be paralleled on the Jewish side. Schlatter's commentary, though neglected in this country, appeared in a second edition in 1925, and in 1929 Dr. H. Odeberg published further evidence in a volume entitled *The Fourth Gospel interpreted in its Relation to the Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World.*

It seems clear, for instance, that some questions of interest to Jews are treated in this Gospel in a way which at least shows

[6] E. Bevan, *Later Greek Religion*, p. 66. J. E. Carpenter, *The Johannine Writings*, p. 350.

knowledge of rabbinic style and methods. We shall return to this point later.

Professor Burney's well-known attempt to prove an Aramaic original for the Fourth Gospel has failed to carry conviction, but it is commonly agreed that he was 'right in regarding the Evangelist as thinking in Aramaic.'[7] If so, we might expect to find traces of quotation from the Old Testament other than from the LXX. In point of fact, however, we find very little. Occasionally, indeed, the Fourth Gospel agrees with the LXX in small points as against the Hebrew.[8] This is not surprising, for there would have been a tendency to correct the text from the LXX; moreover the Evangelist himself would in general naturally quote from the version which both he and his readers in Asia Minor commonly used. Whatever connexion he may have had with Palestine, we should expect to find no more than an occasional reminiscence of the Hebrew where it differs from the LXX; this is exactly what a study of the text reveals.[9] Other considerations, too, may be urged, and it may be taken as certain that the Evangelist, whoever he was, had links with Palestine.

So far, then, we picture the author of the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle (who was possibly the author of the other two brief notes) as an experienced Christian with leanings to mysticism and philosophy, who was familiar with Aramaic and lived in Asia Minor about 100 A.D.

We think of 'the old man' described by Justin,[10] 'of pleasant

[7] F. C. Burkitt, *Theology*, 1922, p. 47. *Cf.* G. R. Driver, *Jewish Guardian*, Jan. 5, Jan. 12, 1923; C. C. Torrey, *H.Th.Rev.*, Oct., 1923; W. E. Barnes, *J.Th.S.*, 1922, pp. 419*ff.*

[8] ii, 17 (*Ps.* lxix, 10, future—Heb. 'hath eaten me'); vi, 45 (*Is.* liv. 13, θεοῦ instead of κύρέου Heb.); xii, 38 (*Is.* liii, 1, adds κύριε): xii, 39, 40 (*Is.* vi, 10, *'I will heal them'*—Heb. 'and be healed').

[9] xii, 14, 15 is a little nearer the Hebrew of *Zec.* ix, 9, πῶλον ὄνου (lxx, πῶλον νέον)—Theodotion reads πῶλον υἱὸν ὄνου ; xiii, 18, *'hath lifted up his heel against me,' Ps.* xli (xl), 10, where the LXX has ἐμεγάλυνεν ἐπ' ἐμέ πτερνισμόν. (Aquila and Theodotion have πτέρνα); xix, 37, *'and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced,' Zech.* xii, 10 (LXX, *'of those over whom they danced in triumph'*—Theodotion εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν).

The argument from supposed mistranslation of an Aramaic original has come to very little. The example, for instance, urged by Burney in vii, 38, has been disposed of by W. E. Barnes (in the article above mentioned—the reference being to *Ezek.* xlvii, 1, 8; *Zech* xiv, 8). One of the most attractive suggestions is that of C. J. Ball: πρῶτός μου (i, 15) = *qadmay* = *first of all.*

[10] *Trypho*, 3. The scene is apparently laid at Ephesus.

appearance, gentle and dignified,' who overtook him near a certain field not far from the sea and spoke to him of the prophets and of the Christ whom they had foretold. 'Pray,' he said, as he took his leave, 'that, above all things, the gates of light may be opened to you; for these things cannot be perceived or understood by all, but only by the man to whom God and His Christ have imparted wisdom.' 'When he had spoken these and many other things, which there is no time for mentioning at present, he went away, bidding me attend to them; and I have not seen him since. But straightway a flame was kindled in my soul; and a love of the prophets, and of those men who are friends of Christ, possessed me; and whilst thus revolving his words in my mind, I found this philosophy alone to be profitable. Thus, and for this reason, I am a philosopher.' It is tempting to picture the author of the Fourth Gospel as such a figure as Justin's unknown friend but of the previous generation.

But we must hasten on to the problem of the sources which the Evangelist used and to the difficult enquiry as to the element of objective history embodied in his narrative. The general scheme of the Gospel is plain:

> 'First, in a solemn prologue, our minds are prepared for the action which is to follow; and then the divine life passes before us in its few cardinal episodes. In the first four chapters the light is seen rising on the world, and all men appear to welcome it and respond to it. Then follows a period of uncertainty, when friends and enemies begin to take sides (v and vi). In the next section (vii-xii) the world settles down into definite antagonism, while the few whom Jesus has chosen are drawn to Him ever more closely. At last He is left alone with the small company of His true disciples, and reveals His inmost heart to them in the quiet of the supper-room (xiii-xvii). Meanwhile the hatred of His enemies, like the love of His chosen friends, has reached its height, and in the remaining chapters we see Him overwhelmed by the powers of darkness, yet in the end rising victorious.'

Such is Dr. E. F. Scott's outline,[11] and its accuracy will be generally admitted. The Evangelist seems to see it all, to live through it all again. Sometimes it is impossible sharply to distinguish between what is supposed to be the Lord's own utterance and the writer's meditation upon it. As von Hügel puts it: 'Jesus, the Baptist and the writer speak so much alike that it is sometimes impossible to say where each speaker begins and ends' (*e.g.* iii, 17-30, 31-36).

[11] *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 16, 17.

The Evangelist does not set out to give a full biography. He deliberately selects: 'Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name' (xx, 30, 31).

The material which the writer uses is drawn from Christian tradition as it has come to him through personal channels.[12] He certainly does not copy out passages from earlier records. It is commonly agreed that he knew St. Mark. Most scholars think that he knew St. Luke, though some prefer to say 'Q.' There is not sufficient evidence to prove that he knew St. Matthew: and yet, writing as he did in Asia Minor about 100 A.D., it would be odd if he did not know all three Synoptic Gospels. But it seems that he uses them from memory: a few phrases stick in his mind, but only a very few.[13]

It cannot, I think, be seriously maintained that the Evangelist invents incidents in order to make allegories of them. He selects from the stories which have come to him and tries to visualize what happened and to live it all over again: and his selection is of incidents in which he sees a deep principle at work.[14] He does not first determine to illustrate a principle and then construct a pictorial embodiment of it. On the other hand, it would be quite natural that the Evangelist should sometimes unconsciously attribute his own thoughts to our Lord, or add a detail to a scene from his own vivid imagination of it.

If this conception of the writer's general character and method is on right lines, it would appear that the search for the sources that he used is likely to be somewhat unremunerative. And this certainly has been the case of recent years.

[12] We note the prominence he gives to the idea of *'witness.'* μαρτυρέω occurs in the Gospel 33 times, I *Jn.* 6, III *Jn.* 4, Synoptics 2; μαρτυρία in the Gospel 14 times, I *Jn.* 6, III *Jn.* 1, Synoptics 4 (all in the accounts of the trial). The witness the writer is thinking of is *the witness of the Church.* It slips out in iii, 11, *'We speak that we do know'*—the voice is the voice of the Church.

[13] *Cf. Jn.* vi, 7 with *Mk.* vi, 37, δηναριών διακοσίων ἄρτους; *Jn.* v, 8, 9 with *Mk.* ii, 11, 12 (note especially κράβαττον); *Jn.* xii, 3 with *Mk.* xiv, 3, μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς (the last word not found elsewhere in Greek literature in this sense); *Jn.* xii, 2 with *Lk.* vii, 38 (anointed his *feet* and wiped them with the *hair* of her head).

[14] W. Lock, *J.Th.S.*, April, 1908, p. 445.

The Mandaean bubble is now burst. Several scholars have been pricking it, notably H. Lietzmann.[15] The Mandaeans have nothing to do with the disciples of John in the early Christian period. Their baptismal ritual shows dependence on the Nestorian Liturgy (which, for example, calls the water used in baptism 'Jordan').[16] Mandaeism represents the Christianizing of an oriental Gnosticism in Arabian times (at the earliest about the seventh century A.D.).

The differences between the Fourth and the Synoptic Gospels have often been clearly stated. Twenty-five years ago there was a tendency to suppose that St. Mark gives us history, or very nearly history, while St. John gives us not history but something else—perhaps Theology. At all events the Fourth Gospel was removed from the field of purely objective history, while the second was allowed to hover on the borderland. The two Gospels are no longer sharply separated, for it is now realized that even St. Mark must be classified with St. John under the heading of 'Gospels' rather than 'Histories.'

All four Gospels are the result of the Church's looking back at the figure of her Founder: they are 'good news' about one whom Christians have already learned to adore as ὁ κύριος. If St. John must be viewed in front of the background afforded by the Epistles of Ignatius, the Synoptists must at least be studied in the light of St. Paul's Epistles. Christology no doubt advances: but there is no gospel which does not assume a Christology, a doctrine of the Person of Christ, already held. And, of course, there is no Gospel which does not include the supernatural. The feeding of the five thousand, the one miracle common to all four narratives, is frankly supernatural. The expectation of the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven is nowhere more vivid than in St. Mark. The supernatural element is in a sense heightened in the Fourth Gospel because 'the whole narrative glows with the retrospect of the religious experience of the Church, which has made the Apostles feel that God's

[15] Ein Beitrag zur Mandäerfrage (Sitzungsbericht der preussichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, xxvii, 1930; pp. 596-608). See also Burkitt, *J.Th.S.*, 1928-1929, pp. 225-227; Lagrange, *Rev. Bibl.* 36 (1927), pp. 321*ff*, 481*ff*, 37 (1928), pp. 1-36.

[16] S. Diettrich, *Liturgia SS. apostolorum Adaei et Maris* (Urmia, 1890).

work in Christ has reflected itself as God's work in them.' But what the Evangelist chiefly does is to relate it to what he regards as the best of contemporary philosophy. It was a better explanation to give of *the life* that was *the light of men* to say that Jesus was the incarnate Logos than to say merely that He was the Christ.

All the canonical accounts of Jesus, then, present ὁ κύριος. The liberal Protestant picture of Jesus as just a gifted Teacher is not the picture of the Gospels. But none of the Gospels as it stands gives us plain objective history. To get that out of them is a very difficult, a hazardous, task; but the attempt must be made. How, in the last resort, are we to picture the real Figure who gave rise to all the stories? To what extent does the Fourth Gospel help us here? St. Mark passed over the field so rapidly that there were plenty of gleanings left for 'Q': and St. Luke found plenty after that. And there must have been much else surviving in floating tradition at the end of the century.

Attention has often been called to the vividness with which incidents like the feeding of the five thousand are described (*Jn.* vi). How far this represents genuine historical reminiscence, and how far it is the result of the Evangelist's powerful imagination, must in most cases remain doubtful. But occasionally he does appear to be right as against the first three Gospels. The exact date of the Crucifixion is a good example. Dalman's recent attempt to support the Synoptic dating is not convincing.[17] Sometimes also the Fourth Evangelist seems to supplement the Synoptic representation of Christ's teaching where that representation may have been inadequate: notably in two respects. The first is to be found in connexion with the disputes with the rabbis. Dr. Abraham has called attention to several points, for example, the *a fortiori* argument from the rite of circumcision (*Jn.* vii, 22). This is thoroughly in the rabbinic spirit and is an argument attributed to R. Eleazar b. Azariah (first century, A.D.).[18] In this matter considerable weight must be given to Dr. Abrahams' opinion: 'My own general impression,' he writes,[19] 'without asserting an early date for the Fourth Gospel, is that

[17] W. F. Howard, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

[18] *Cf. Shabbath*, xix.

[19] *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, p. 12.

that Gospel enshrines a genuine tradition of an aspect of Jesus' teaching which has not found a place in the Synoptics.'

Dr. Abrahams, in a paper read before Cambridge Theological Society, went so far as to maintain that Mark cannot be right in placing the discussions about 'washings' in Galilee; and to suggest that underlying the Synoptic report as to the instigators of the attack being Pharisees from Jerusalem we may detect an older tradition that the discussion took place *in* Jerusalem.[20]

The other matter in which the Synoptics may well be held to need supplementing from the Fourth Gospel is more important. Later developments of Christology can hardly be understood unless we may suppose that Jesus was Himself conscious of a special nearness to God. Even in the Synoptic Gospels He does not couple Himself with His disciples in the phrase 'Our Father.' Where '*Our Father*,' if it occurred, might have been taken in that sense, we find 'Your Father.' And we have, of course, the striking passage from 'Q' (*Mt.* xi, 25-27; *Lk.* x, 21-22):

> 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth who the Son is, save the Father; and who the Father is save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.'

But it is in the Fourth Gospel that this view of Christ's relation to the Father (which must, in its essence at all events, go back to Christ Himself) is really brought out. Here '*the Son*' (absolutely) is found on our Lord's lips twelve times, and twice in the comment of the Evangelist. Indeed, as Archdeacon Rawlinson puts it, 'the Christological idea which is really characteristic of this Gospel is the idea of our Lord as the Son of God.'[21]

Such considerations encourage us to look further: but if we do not find in outline a connected history of our Lord's ministry in St. Mark we could hardly expect to find it here: and always we must keep our eyes open for later Christian teaching which, by the time it reaches or leaves the Evangelist, has been attributed to Christ Himself. A great deal of work has been done by way of examining both the narrative and the teaching of the Gospel, and Dr. Howard gives a useful summary of it. He describes the various attempts which have been made to improve

[20] Quoted by A. E. Brooke in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 318.

[21] *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, p. 209.

the sequence of the narrative by rearranging sections of it. The most attractive rearrangement is that which places vi before, and vii 15-24 after, v; vii, 15-24, certainly seems to give us the conclusion of v, and vi would read better between iv and v. So Bernard in his edition of the Gospel puts iv, vi (taken as referring to Passover, 28), v, vii, 15-24 (Pentecost), vii, 1-14, vii, 25-52 (Tabernacles).

Probably the disarrangement goes as far back as the writer himself. We must not think of him as finishing his work at a sitting. He seems to have gone over it again and again, inserting comments (*e.g.* i, 6-8, 15), perhaps beginning stories (*e.g.* the story of the visit of the Greeks—xii) which he never finishes. It is not unlikely that he wrote two meditations at different times upon the discourse in the Upper Room, and so on.

But Bernard would seem to be a little over-confident when he actually prints not only the rearrangement above (about which there seems to be a general agreement) but others where there is still a great difference of opinion. Morover, however much we rearrange, we still get only a series of 'Scenes from the Lord's ministry,' not a connected account of it.

Again, in reading our Lord's discourses we must be on the look our for later Christian teaching afterwards attributed to Him. Von Hügel quotes Iamblichus (died *c.* 330):

> 'This was admirable' (among the Neo-Pythagoreans) 'that they ascribed everything to Pythagoras; but few of them acknowledge their own works as their own' (*de Pythag. vita,* 198).

We must not forget that Christian prophets very likely uttered revelations which gained wide acceptance, and perhaps spoke in the name of Christ, as we actually find the author of some of the Odes of Solomon doing, *e.g.*:

> 'I was strengthened and made mighty, and took the world captive' (Ode x).
>
> 'Death hath been destroyed before my face: and Sheol hath been abolished by my word' (Ode xv).[22]

We must constantly take account of the formative influence of oral teaching and preaching in the shaping of the Gospel. Thus Stanton suggests that the writer was led to place the discourse about the Eucharist where he does, just after the miracle

[22] *Cf.* Odes xvii and xlii.

of the feeding, from his having been accustomed to use that miracle in his instruction of Christian assemblies as a text for setting forth Jesus as the living bread.[23]

Similar allowances have to be made, of course, in connexion with the Synoptic Gospels, but not to the same extent. When all is said, it is in the first three Gospels that we hear most clearly the human voice of Jesus of Nazareth: in the Fourth Gospel we feel that it is a voice from Eternity that speaks to us. Behind the former lies, if we may use an expression of Schweitzer's, the 'Christ-mysticism' of St. Paul: behind the latter is the 'God-mysticism' characteristic of Hellenistic piety.

In closing this paper perhaps I may be allowed just to touch on the question of the identity of the author. The hypothesis that he was John the Presbyter spoken of by Papias, that he was a Palestinian who had, as a boy, seen the Lord and was himself a disciple of John the son of Zebedee (to whom he refers as 'the disciple whom Jesus loved') and that later he settled at Ephesus —a hypothesis strongly advocated by Streeter and accepted by Bernard—is attracting a good deal of favour. There are two main forms of the theory, and each is not without its difficulties.

In passing, we may note that the objections which have been pointed out by Garvie and others to the identification of the Beloved Disciple with the son of Zebedee are by no means sufficient to erase the *prima facie* impression that this is the person the author had in mind.[24]

The first form of the theory which attributes the Gospel and I *John* to the Elder John is that developed by Streeter. Streeter accepts the tradition of an early martyrdom of John the son of Zebedee. He recognizes that there were two Johns in Asia in the first century: the first, John the Seer, who wrote from Patmos and addressed his work to the seven churches of Asia, not John the son of Zebedee, though identified with him by Justin Martyr; and the second, John the Elder, the author of the Fourth Gospel and all three Epistles. Bernard rejects the tradition of the early martyrdom of John the son of Zebedee on grounds which seem to me convincing (and which have convinced Peake and Stanton,

[23] *Op. cit.*, iii, p. 240 quoted Howard, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

[24] Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 432; E. Meyer, *Ursprung u. Anfänge des Christentums*, I, p. 312. *Cf.* Howard, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

Harnack and Armitage Robinson), and accepts the testimony of Irenaeus that this John, the son of Zebedee, resided for a long time in Asia: he is, indeed, the only John Irenaeus knows of there. This tradition of the residence of this John in Asia is presupposed, it may be added, in the *Acts of John*, a Gnostic romance which M. R. James thinks may be as early as 150 A.D. Bernard suggests that the Apostle wrote the Apocalypse, and that John the Elder, his disciple, wrote the Gospel and the Epistles.

The hypothesis that John the Elder mentioned by Papias wrote the Gospel and the Epistles is an attractive one: but it leaves something to explain in the language Papias uses about him. According to Irenaeus v, 33.3 (a passage extant only in Latin and Armenian), it would appear that Papias[25] claimed to have received from John the famous description of the vines of the Millenium as a description given by our Lord:

> 'As the elders remember, which saw John the Lord's disciple, that they heard from him how the Lord taught concerning those times, and said: The days shall come wherein vines shall grow each having ten thousand branches, and on one branch ten thousand shoots, and on every shoot ten thousand clusters, and in every cluster ten thousand grapes, and every grape when it is pressed shall yield five and twenty measures of wine. And when any of the saints taketh hold of one of the clusters, another will cry out: I am a better cluster, take me; through me bless thou the Lord. Likewise also *he said* that a grain of wheat shall bring forth ten thousand ears, and every ear shall have ten thousand grains, and every grain *shall yield* five double pounds of flour; and all other fruits and seeds and plants in the same proportion: and all animals using those foods which are got from the earth shall be peaceable and in concord one with another, subject unto men with all obedience. These things Papias also, a hearer of John, and an associate of Polycarp, an ancient worthy, testifies in writing in the fourth of his books—for he wrote five. And he adds, saying: But these things are credible unto believers. And, he says, when Judas the traitor believed not, and asked: How then shall these growths be accomplished by the Lord? the Lord said: They shall see who shall come thereto.'[26]

Is the man through whom, directly or indirectly,[27] all this could be reported to Papias the author of the Fourth Gospel?

[25] *Cf.* V. H. Stanton, *op. cit.*, I, p. 170.

[26] The Messianic kingdom is described in similar terms in *Apoc. Baruch*, xxix, 5 (M. R. James, *The Apochryphal New Testament*, p. 37).

[27] Probably it is safest to assume (as Eusebius himself does in *H.E.* iii, 39) that Papias claims no more than to have heard from the Elders indirectly, though in certain cases at only one remove. See Vernon Bartlet on *Papias* in Hasting's Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.

Not without reason Armitage Robinson once said, 'That mole never made such a mountain.'[28] But perhaps Canon Streeter would reply that Papias really meant John the Seer, not John the Elder. Are we then to suppose some confusion of thought on the part of Papias? We recall the opinion of Eusebius :

> 'He evidently was a man of very mean capacity, one may say, judging from his own statements.'

Furthermore, is the estimate of the Second Gospel which Papias quotes from the Elder to be attributed to the author of the Fourth Gospel? The whole passage in Eusebius runs as follows :

> 'Papias also gives in his own work other accounts of the words of the Lord on the authority of Aristion, who has been mentioned above, and traditions of the Elder John. To these we refer the curious, and for our present purpose we will merely add to his words, which have been quoted above, a tradition, which has been set forth through these sources, concerning Mark who wrote the Gospel :—
>
> And the Elder said this also : Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately everything that he remembered, without however[29] recording in order what was either said or done by Christ. For neither did he hear the Lord, nor did he follow Him ; but afterwards, as I said, Peter, who adapted his instructions to the needs of his hearers, but had no design of giving a connected account of the Lord's oracles. So then Mark made no mistake, while he thus wrote down some things as he remembered them ; for he made it his own care not to omit anything that he heard, or to set down any false statement therein.'

The time appears to be getting ripe for a fresh study of this 'ancient worthy,' as Irenaeus calls him. Is there no hope of discovering some manuscript of his works still lurking in some library, buried perhaps in an Armenian translation? According to Salmon (in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*) the latest trace of the existence of a manuscript of Papias is that in an inventory of 1218 of the possessions of the Cathedral of Nismes. But even without anticipating a sensational discovery of this kind, the elusive figure of this early Bishop of Hierapolis may be commended to the further attention of New Testament scholars.

[28] *Cf.* Stanton, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 168*ff.*

[29] μέντοι, a word which occurs five times in the Fourth Gospel and only three times elsewhere in the New Testament (II *Tim.*, *James*, *Jude*).

THE DOUBLE ENTENDRE IN MODERN ANGLICANISM

By the Reverend A. G. Coombs, M.A.

WHEN the Christian Church set itself the task of drawing up creeds and formulae in order to give precise verbal definition to its beliefs, it embarked on an undertaking which subsequent experience has shown to be beset by difficulties both intellectual and moral.

It is a limitation common to all men that they frequently find themselves at a loss when they are endeavouring to give expression to their thoughts. Word and phrases, however nicely weighed and constructed, are not seldom inadequate, and the loftier the quality of a man's thoughts the more difficult it is for him to give adequate expression to them. In the realm of religious experience the difficulty becomes acute, hence the frequent protestation of the mystics. There are

> 'Mysterious motions of the soul, no way
> To be defined but in strange melodies.'

Here the sheer inadequacy of language is so apparent that when the written page is before us we frequently find ourselves reading between the lines in an attempt to achieve a more coherent idea of what the writer is struggling to express. This course has ample justification, for it is not reasonable to expect that those who have been caught up into the third heaven should find human language anything other than a cumbersome and unwieldly framework for their revelations.

But the writings of the mystics are not systematic formulations of theology, and we must draw a clear distinction between the two. And whereas in the former case we may reasonably allow ourselves a large freedom to interpret, such freedom in the latter case is not permissible and is even absurd. A formula, theological or otherwise, is intended to define, and after reading a theological formula we ought to know where we stand in regard to the doctrine formulated. The point is that it should be couched in aptly selected words so that its meaning shall be clear and unambiguous. Trench, speaking of the new theologi-

cal terms that have been evolved in the course of doctrinal controversy, quotes Shedd :

> 'The success and enduring influence of any systematic construction of truth, be it secular or sacred, depends as much upon an exact terminology as upon close and deep thinking itself. Indeed, unless the results at which the human mind arrives are plainly fixed, and firmly fixed in an exact phraseology, its thinking is to very little purpose in the end.' [1]

In passing, we may recall the suggestion that the now highly misleading word 'person' should be removed from Trinitarian phraseology and replaced by some other technical word not open to misinterpretation, one which should warn us that we are in the deep waters of divine mysteries and at the same time anchor us securely well clear of the rocks of tritheism. If theologians ever thought seriously of this suggestion they would probably find it best to coin, with or without the assistance of Professor Otto, an entirely new word specially to meet the case. (Perhaps the creation of such an unambiguous word would perform the further useful service of showing that there are limits beyond which definition is presumptuous.)

Ambiguity signifies an expression capable of more than one meaning. Expressions of this sort may be accidental; more often they are deliberate. The attempts in the political field at formula-finding are frequently designed to cover up, for the sake of a working agreement, divergencies of opinion. The method of achieving this is by the use of verbal constructions into which different shades of meaning can be read. Here we are in the land of compromise, a land where the spirit of accommodation registers a clear advance on the intolerance of the mere partizan. Compromise, moreover, is inevitable and, within certain limits, salutary in the political sphere. Here policy has to be framed so that it shall be in general accord with the current views of the main body of electors. This is by no means necessarily to cast aspersions on the integrity of statesmen, for, as Morley points out, compromise may be of two kinds :

> 'It may stand for two distinct attitudes of mind, one of them obstructive and the other not. It may mean the deliberate suppression or mutilation of an idea, in order to make it congruous with the traditional idea or the current prejudice on the given subject, whatever that may be. Or else it may mean a rational acquiescence in the fact that the bulk of your contemporaries are not yet prepared either to embrace

[1] *History of Christian Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 362.

the new idea, or to change their ways of living in conformity to it. In the one case, the compromiser rejects the highest truth, or dissembles his own acceptance of it. In the other, he holds it courageously for his ensign and device, but neither forces nor expects the whole world straightway to follow. The first prolongs the duration of the empire of prejudice, and retards the arrival of improvement. The second does his best to abbreviate the one, and to hasten and make definite the other, yet he does not insist on hurrying changes which, to be effective, would require the active support of numbers of persons not yet ripe for them.' [2]

But the ground on which compromise can be defended in social affairs is precisely the ground on which it is indefensible in the sphere of theology. For here men are not aiming to adjust their ideas to those of any group of persons, but to the truth as they understand it. This is not to ignore the fact that truth has more than one aspect and that no one person can be equally authoritative upon all aspects, but it is to assert that when a person sets out to speak of some aspect of the truth with which he is specially qualified to deal, he should strive for the greatest possible lucidity and the most exact phraseology. Theology can hardly retain its claim to be styled scientific if instead of clearing issues it obscures them.

Now one of the insistent temptations of a comprehensive Church is this temptation to obscure issues. We are used to and we can afford to overlook the derision which is provoked in some by the contemplation of a Church striving to be at once Catholic and Reformed.

'Without either one or the other, the English Church would not only have lost the services of many excellent men, but would have been narrowed in range, lowered in tone, lessened in numbers, character, and influence.' [3]

In fact, we uphold comprehensiveness not merely on utilitarian grounds but on principle. The Church of England only brings discredit upon itself in this matter, and then justifiably, when it tries to comprehend ideas which are mutually contradictory.

It is for this reason that we can seldom regard the ecclesiastical statesman as an unmixed blessing. He is often applauded for his sanity and balance (two estimable virtues), but not once nor twice in the pages of Church history we see the mess he has left for a subsequent generation to clear up. Often, for the sake

[2] *On Compromise*, pp. 208 *f*.
[3] *English Church in the Eighteenth Century* (Abbey & Overton), p. 148.

of quietness in the land, he buried an issue that was vital, and because of its vitality it rose again. It had stoutly refused to become a corpse merely because it had been shrouded in obscurity. Clearly it is not in ecclesiastical statesmanship that the strength of Anglicanism resides. We find it rather in the will to unity and the mutual tolerance, oiled with a sense of humour, amongst law-abiding churchmen. Morley, speaking of religious conformity in the home, says :

> 'The truth of the matter is that the painful element in companionship is not difference of opinion, but discord of temperament. The important thing is not that two people should be inspired by the same convictions, but rather that each of them should hold his or her own convictions in a high and worthy spirit. Harmony of aim, not identity of conclusion, is the secret of the sympathetic life.'[4]

This might have been spoken in reference to the Church of England.

Now there is no lack of harmony of aim in the Church of England except such as has been introduced by the Rome-sick mentality. While the main body of English Churchmen—Catholic, Evangelical, Modernist—are working together to make our National Church a worthy instrument for the Christianizing of England, a minority, though nominally with us, are in *ethos* and doctrine elsewhere. Meanwhile truth must suffer many things, for it seems to be the official policy generally to be ambiguous in order to keep the peace.

Parmenides expounded his philosophy in verse. It was a laudable effort, but not one that worked out well in practice. Of necessity he had to subordinate precision of language to exigency of metre, and inevitably it was by no means clear what he meant. Though in places it appears to wax almost poetical, we cannot urge the excuse that it is written in verse on behalf of the recent Statement concerning Eucharistic belief. Nevertheless, it is by no means free from ambiguity. Mention is made in an introduction of the 'failure in the wish to understand what others think and feel and mean.' There is surprisingly little evidence of this failure in the Church of England; its existence is almost entirely confined to those four-square Fundamentalists and rigid Anglo-Catholics who are fast bound in the grip of immutable pre-conceptions. The 'failure' is due far more to lack

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 184.

of clarity than lack of charity, and it is for this very reason that this recent Statement is likely to hurt where it sets out to heal. The promoters have acted from the highest motives of charity and conciliation, but what has been the result?

The *Church Times*, in its leading article on October 9, finds that the Statement is by no means free from ambiguity. At least two serious difficulties are mentioned; one arising out of the assertion that the consecration is the act of Christ 'in response to the liturgical prayer and action taken as a whole'; the other out of the treatment of the question of the effect of consecration. Catholics cannot be satisfied in either case. The latter 'they can only regard as a very incomplete statement of the subject with the consequence of further misconception and recrimination later on.' The *Church Times* is clear whither the path of ambiguity leads. And so is Prebendary Hinde. He is one of a group of Evangelicals who, while recognizing the sincere and earnest efforts of the promoters, could not sign the Statement. Among other reasons given is this:

> 'There are some passages in it which obviously may be read in more than one sense . . . Keenly desirous as we are of unity, we feel that it can never be obtained by giving assent to ambiguous statements on matters of vital importance.'

Further, there is serious objection to the opening clause of the Statement. Since distinguished Liberal scholars, both Catholic and Evangelical, have agreed to it, one is compelled to believe that there must be a loophole for them somewhere in the clause. They, at all events, are well aware that New Testament critical research has rendered at least doubtful the authenticity of the words 'Do this in remembrance of me.' Modernists would agree 'that the Church has been right in regarding the Eucharist as the most sacred act in her worship,' but they would not assent to the view that this depends upon certain Dominical words, still less upon the importation of a technical meaning into the word 'Do.'

But this Eucharistic Eirenicon does not stand in proud isolation. On the contrary, it is in a succession of 'apostolic' rank. It will be worth while to cite further instances. When the Revised Prayer Book was sent to Parliament on the second occasion it was clearly stated by the majority of the bishops that

no important changes had been made in this book as compared with its ill-fated predecessor. All that had been done was with a view to the removal of misapprehensions and the clarifying of the intentions and limitations of the Deposited Book. Otherwise it was 'the same book.' 'None of the few amendments in the present measure makes any real change in the contents of book,' said the Archbishop of York. Yet these amendments were such that they caused a 'real change' in the attitude of that very perspicacious Anglo-Catholic, Dr. Frere. It was clear to him that whatever might be said about the alterations, they could and would be interpreted as constituting a change hostile to Anglo-Catholic doctrine. Parliament however was equally perspicacious. Had M.P.'s been entirely blind to the import of theological or rubrical refinements, they could hardly fail to see the significance in the Church of England of such a service as the Consecration of a Convent Chapel by the Bishop of St. Albans on October 22, 1927.[5]

The third Report of the 1930 Lambeth Conference, that on the Unity of the Church, shows clearly how the trend of reunion negotiations may be influenced by words or expressions of doubtful significance. In the *Resumé* of the discussions with the Orthodox Church it is asserted to be the doctrine of the Church of England 'that after Communion the consecrated elements remaining are regarded as the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ in that they have the same efficacy as before the administration' (p. 135). Whether this is or is not a solid argument for perpetual Reservation, Adoration and Benediction depends of course on the meaning with which the word 'efficacy' is invested. Our formularies at all events are quite clear on this point. Efficacy according to them lies in reception.

In this same Report, on p. 139, there occurs the phrase 'the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.' Apart from the fact that this phrase is not in the Prayer Book, it is notoriously ambiguous, and uncertainty as to its significance is by no means dissipated by the Archbishops' Reply to Leo XIII, quoted on p. 136.

Again, what is meant by the phrase 'the essentials of the Christian faith'? It has appeared recently in the Resolution passed by Convocation concerning inter-communion with the

[5] See *The Prayer-Book Crisis*, by W. Joynson-Hicks, p. 157 *ff*.

Old Catholics. The unfortunate fact is that Christians cannot agree as to what are the essentials of the Christian faith. Some consider that to take Communion after breaking the fast is a mortal sin, which consideration seems to imply that fasting Communion is an essential of the Christian faith. It is imperative, therefore, that we should not use such words as 'fundamentals' or 'essentials' without close definition as to the meaning we wish to be conveyed by them.

Here then are symptoms of what would appear to be a new genius in the Church of England. Our Church has, until now, tacitly admitted that while a theological formula can define and clear an issue between the true and the false, yet it is still tentative and not absolutely conclusive. It is for this reason that we find existing side by side in our formularies what may be called the Catholic and the Evangelical emphasis. The emphasis in both cases is clear and unmistakable. A Catholic, therefore, does not turn to what is obviously a buttress for Evangelical doctrine and then, following Newman's method in Tract xc, proceed to read into it a Catholic interpretation. He turns to something that is patent only of a Catholic interpretation and emphasizes that in his teaching. Similarly the Evangelical. Ambiguity clearly exists, but it results from the fact that there are two clear strands in our formularies which countenance two different types of belief. But now the prevailing tendency is so to contrive phrases that the *same* formularies shall countenance two, or more, different types of belief. Hitherto the rule has been 'Let both grow together'; now we seem to be in the midst of a grafting process which sets out to merge differences in an artificial way. It is not along this way that greater unity lies. This however is the increasingly popular way amongst many of our leaders of giving a semblance of justification to beliefs and practices for which there is no semblance of justification in our present formularies, Catholic and Evangelical though they be.

The fact is that certain doctrines alien to the Anglican tradition have established themselves in our midst, and in spite of the moral suasion and fatherly admonition of bishops, stoutly refuse to budge. It is clear that only by a slow and patient process of education will the hurt be healed. But the effect of the tendency we have been discussing is to heal up the hurt prema-

turely, leaving the exotic 'matter' within either to break out again or, more disastrously still, to work through and debilitate the whole system. If fostered, this policy may achieve a temporary success such as that of the French Jesuits of the eighteenth century, who won back much of Reformed France to Rome by equivocal promises of salvation. But such success would be costly in the long run.

The Roman minor deity, Janus, was the patron of doorways. His figure is represented as having two faces looking in opposite directions. This is a symbol of the outlook to which, hitherto, the English Church has been true, *i.e.* the recognition that there may be two views on a matter. At the same time these two views may co-exist on a practical basis of common purpose. In some recent Anglican statements, on the other hand, we catch more than a fleeting glimpse of the shade of the Delphic Oracle. It was the utterance of the priestess of Delphi, phrased always to convey a double meaning, which has bequeathed us the word 'delphic.'

Thus far the delphic utterances we have considered have been concerned primarily with mediaeval doctrine about which the Church of England made up its mind at the Reformation. Now we must turn to other questions upon which decisions were impossible of attainment then for the simple reason that they had not then arisen.

'New truth makes ancient good uncouth.' It is because we have now to deal with formularies whose *milieu* of thought and experience is wholly different from our own that we find the need for the reformulation of doctrine so pressing. But in the opinion of some this need can be satisfactorily met by reading new meanings into old words, thus reconciling the old with the new without the necessity for reformulation. What the premium on this policy is will be best seen with the help of a few examples.

The belief in the resurrection of the body was in the intention of the framers of this belief as crude and realistic as it is in some minds even to-day. Yet no thoughtful person now believes in a 'resurrection of relics.' Hence the phrase 'resurrection of the body' is ever liable to ambiguous treatment. This could not be more convincingly illustrated than by quoting from a letter sent to the *Church Times* by the late Bishop Gore in 1924:

> 'I affirmed in the strongest language the resurrection of the body (and by 'body' must be meant a *material* organ), but denied that this doctrine carried with it the idea of the re-collection at the Day of Judgment of the material particles of our dead bodies.'[6]

Now even supposing that the word 'material' might be referring to the theory of an ethereal body, built up by the personality in this present life, it is still not clear what the word 'resurrection' signifies, unless indeed that the dead physical body retains temporary hold on the ethereal body, which in that case would rise again on some occasion. Such grotesque surmising would have been repudiated by Bishop Gore, yet unless words can mean anything it is difficult to escape their obvious implications.

The doctrines of Christ's descent into hades and His ascent into heaven presuppose the view that hades and heaven are particular places. (There is a sense in which we must not abandon the belief in a local heaven, namely, in so far as it is complementary to the prayer 'Thy kingdom come, *on earth* as it is in heaven.') But the old geocentric conception of the Universe is entirely discredited. Even the most 'orthodox' theologians are weary of hearing this, so whole-heartedly do they acknowledge that it is so. Yet some who will wait breathlessly for the next dictum of Sir James Jeans are still prepared to maintain that at the Ascension the physical body of Christ was carried up above the clouds. This ascension is regarded as having evidential value, but since it is already agreed that heaven is not a particular place above the clouds, one cannot escape the conclusion that the evidence is misleading. Thus does ambiguity lead us into irrelevance.

No word has given more ground for the popular superstitions in regard to Infant Baptism than the word 'sin.' Now on whatever ground we justify the baptism of unconscious infants, it is not on the ground that they have inherited someone else's sin. To say that in this connection sin means weakness brings the idea into line with undisputed fact, but that is not the meaning of the word either in history or experience. There is in reality no such thing as this vague abstract entity, sin.[7] Sins there are in plenty, and concrete enough, but each particular sin is the result of a particular individual's will and choice, and

[6] Quoted in *Modern Churchman*, September, 1925.

[7] See, e.g., *The Sin Obsession*, by Dr. P. Dearmer.

apart from a particular individual's will and choice there can be no sin. Hence to speak of an unconscious infant's sin is meaningless; to speak of his sins is a gratuitous insult. But if this word was to be removed from the Baptismal Office, that Office, to remain logically coherent, would need further revision of a radical order. In spite of certain improvements, the issue was not squarely faced in the 1927 Revised Office. In that Office we still pray that the infant may receive remission of sin and speak of his being washed from sin. It is difficult to see how an ethical rationale of infant baptism is possible so long as such phrases as these are retained.

The word 'satisfaction' in the prayer of Consecration has had a long and intimate connection with sub-Christian theories of the Atonement. For that reason it was disquieting to find that it had not been expunged from the Communion Office of the Revised Prayer Book. In the hands of Dr. Kirk, however, this word is robbed of its evil associations. Study of patristic thought has shown him that it means, 'not an "adequate compensation" to God for the offence committed, but rather a "suitable acknowledgment" thereof, and a pledge of newness of life.'[8] Thus Dr. Kirk is enabled to use this word without any scruple. But to the ordinary instructed Christian with no deep knowledge of patristic theology and of scholastic casuistry there is not the meaning of the word, and to him it remains an unreality and a cause of offence.

These instances will be sufficient to show how easily theology may descend from its high estate as a science and become a subtle 'art' by which to avoid the issues which not only scientific and historic research but the moral conscience of our time are setting before us. Such equivocation is as intellectually irritating as it is morally reprehensible, unless indeed we are prepared to justify it in the same way that Kierkegard extols paradoxical belief, namely, because there is an element of uncertainty about it. The flickering candle of faith which lights the pilgrim through the darkness is not rendered more effective by the *ignis fatuus* of doctrinal ambiguity.

[8] *Essays Catholic and Critical*, p. 278.

PROTESTANTISM IN SPAIN

By the Rev. C. H. D. Grimes, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.,
British Chaplain in Barcelona.

SINCE the Revolution in Spain last April, and the subsequent constitutional changes, great interest has arisen concerning its ultimate effect upon the religious life of the nation. This interest has been further stimulated by the recent dissolution and expulsion of the Jesuit Order.

It would be a mistake to regard the Government as being hostile to religion. It is, however, definitely opposed to ecclesiastical interference in politics and the Church's accumulation of the nation's wealth. The Prime Minister, who is a loyal Roman Catholic, a few years ago translated into Spanish, for the first time, George Borrow's book, *The Bible in Spain*, and in the introduction to his translation he speaks favourably of the influence of the Bible. Several other ministers of the Government have definitely shown themselves on the side of religion.

In accordance with Spanish tradition, the past history of the nation has been intimately connected with the Church, to the extent that its king's have been styled 'Most Catholic Majesty.' Senor Madriaga in his most interesting book, *Englishman, Frenchman, and Spaniard*, maintains that the outstanding characteristic of the Spaniard is passion, and he proceeds to show how it is pre-eminently revealed in the sphere of religion. So much so that Philip II, in spite of the advice of his statesmen and military officers, refused to make terms with the heretics, and as a consequence lost not only the Low Countries, but also the Spanish predominance in Europe.

Another example of this passionate, almost fanatical, religiosity of the Spaniard is seen in the Middle Ages by the ruthless expulsion of the Jews and Moors, as a result of which Spain was weakened tremendously from every point of view. How, then, is the Spaniard going to face the entirely new position which has arisen, especially when it is considered that up to 1869 no other religion was tolerated except the Roman Catholic? Even then Protestantism was scarcely tolerated, and it was subjected to petty persecutions which were instigated by the hostile curés or by the misguided officials of the State.

To-day all this has changed. All religious practices which do not offend against public order are permitted. The clergy receive their stipends from the State for the next two years. After this the Church will be disestablished and all special privileges will cease.

Protestants quite naturally anticipated that with the coming into force of complete freedom of worship and equality of treatment there would have been a great religious landslide in their favour. But their expectations have not been realised. The first apparent effect of the new era has been the spread of atheism and neglect of religion. For example, in one garrison town where six hundred men paraded for Mass on the Sunday before the Republic was declared, on the following Sunday only one man paraded for this service. Whilst this is typical of many cases, it is far from correct to say that the Spanish churches are deserted to-day.

At first, so far as the Protestants were concerned, they had very successful public meetings and many inquirerrs came forward. Then a law was introduced forbidding religious meetings in public places but permitting them in private buildings. This law was directed against political propaganda promoted by the Romanists, but unfortunately it checked a fruitful source of Protstant work. Further, the expulsion of the Jesuits and the measures taken by the Government against the Roman Catholic Church have provoked a religious reaction in its favour.

At the time of the Reformation, Protestantism was extirpated in Spain by the aid of the Jesuits and the Inquisition, which continued till 1812. In 1869 Queen Isabella took the road from Madrid to Paris, and General Prim (mark the name) set up a provisional Government which granted religious toleration, although at that time there were very few Protestants in Spain. There was a small congregation at Seville ministered to by the Rev. L. S. Tugwell, who was living there after having been invalided home from work in South America. He appealed for assistance in the English press and raised sufficient money to buy the disused Church of San Basilo. Shortly afterwards this church obtained the services of Senor Palmores, who had been chaplain to a Spanish nobleman living in England. He was attracted by the English Church and became a member of it.

Afterwards he accepted the call to Seville, where he laboured with great success for many years. Such was the beginning of the Spanish Episcopal Reformed Church. At first there was a great increase of membership, but subsequently there was a distinct decline owing to sustained persecution. Whilst the Spanish people accept with great enthusiasm and readiness that which is new, their constancy is always uncertain. In the recent incipient revolt this peculiar characteristic of the Latin race proved a great blessing, otherwise the consequences might have been disastrous.

The Spanish Reformed Episcopal Church was next faced with the difficulty of finding a Church which would consecrate as its first bishop Senor Cabrera. It appealed to the Church of England, the Church of Ireland, and the Episcopal Church of America. Eventually the Church of Ireland permitted the Archbishop of Dublin to act as the consecrator. Since the death of Bishop Cabrera, the episcopal succession has not been continued, and the Archbishop of Dublin undertakes visitation and supervision. Last September the present Archbishop of Dublin, who is an accomplished Spanish scholar and linguist, presided over the triennial Synod at Valencia. He held ordinations and confirmations in several of its churches in Spain and Portugal.

There is a fine church in Madrid, where the son of the late Bishop Cabrera is the priest in charge. This church was to have been consecrated by the Archbishop of Dublin in 1892, but at the last moment the Government refused the holding of the ceremony on the pretence that a riot was anticipated. The Archbishop was actually kept a prisoner in the house of Senor Cabrera, as the Government ordered that no person should leave his house. It was owing to the intercession of the British Ambassador that he regained his liberty. In spite of the fact that he was unable to consecrate the church, he held ordinations and confirmations in a hall. Two years later the Archbishop of Dublin consecrated Senor Cabrera as the first bishop of the Spanish Reformed Episcopal Church, which follows the Mozarabic rite. The Mozarabic rite was common in Spain till the end of the eleventh century, and is still permitted by the Pope in a few churches.

The Reformed churches have schools, which serve the double

purpose of winning converts and augmenting the stipends of the clergy, since there are no rich members in the congregations to give financial support.

In addition to the Spanish Reformed Episcopal Church, there are the Wesleyan Church, the Baptist Church, the Plymouth Brethren and the Y.M.C.A., which exist as independent communities and societies all dependent upon financial grants obtained from England and America. There is an International Committee under which these communities and societies are grouped in a loose federation. The Plymouth Brethren, since they have no paid ministers, have the widest organization next to the Spanish Reformed Episcopal Church. The Wesleyan and Baptist Churches have schools attached to them. At Barcelona, the Wesleyan Church has a school with 400 pupils.

There are the colporteurs of the Bible Society, who sell on an average 240,000 copies of the Bible or the New Testament every year. Considering that there are only 10,000 Protestants in Spain, these sales show that the Bible is read by many who have never declared themselves as being Protestants. These colporteurs tell many stories of the opposition with which they meet from the curé, and very often of his being routed by the sturdy independence of the Spanish character.

After sixty years, it is not very encouraging to acknowledge that there are only ten thousand declared Protestants out of a population of 21½ millions. Whilst the Spanish peasant has nothing to lose to-day by becoming Protestant, members of the professional and commercial classes incur considerable risk of losing their livelihood by being converted. Spanish Protestantism is seriously crippled for want of financial support. Some time ago a Commission was sent out to South America in order to obtain help from the rich Protestants there. Unfortunately some Germans were allowed to go, and they succeeded in collecting by far the greater proportion of the money for their own Church.

It should not be forgotten that South America still looks on Spain as its homeland now that the Republics have had time to forget the wars of liberation. The formation of a strong Protestant feeling in Spain would doubtless have far-reaching effects throughout the Spanish-speaking world. If only some

able young men could be found in Spain, or in South America, or in England, a great deal might be done to change the present state of Protestantism, which is handicapped by an inferiority complex. At present Spanish Protestantism is quite unable to deal with the arguments of the Jesuit on the one hand, and the secularist on the other. *Ecclesia docens*—'the teaching Church'—will not only make for stability in the State, but also progress in the religious life of the Spanish nation. *Plus ultra* is the motto of the nation; and let us hope that it is also the motto of Spanish Protestantism, more especially if, laying aside its old quarrel with Rome, it sets itself to capture the growing mass which is unable to profess Christianity in the discredited thought-forms of the past, whether Catholic or Protestant.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE RELEVANCE OF CHRISTIANITY*

It is not inadequate praise of this book to say that it is worthy of its title; and it is as readable as it is relevant. It is the author's conviction that unless Christianity can face and overcome the moral chaos of our time, its relevance is reduced to insignificance. Oracular authoritarian methods, of whatever kind, are useless: they involve a portentous begging of the deepest questions at issue. The question is

> 'Can Christianity come out into the open, take a survey of the various new factors, psychological, economic, sociological, and offer creative moral leadership at once more progressive and more stable than non-Christian thinking can promise?'

But Mr. Barry's work is no ordinary book of moral philosophy, nor yet of Christian ethics: his own sub-title, 'An Approach to Christian Ethics,' fairly describes it. He sees clearly that ethics cannot be its own adequate basis; that it is useless to discuss it in the void; that it everywhere presupposes certain beliefs about man, his whence and his whither and his nature meanwhile; and that these beliefs belong ultimately to Theology, not to Anthropology. In a word, Christian morals are rooted in Christian faith and, cut off from their root, wither. It is, of course, the facts of our world, not Mr. Barry, which have demonstrated this; but he drives the truth home with luminous directness and shows why it must needs be so. His book falls into two parts, and the contents of the second part find their vindication as well as their basis in the first.

I will try to give a brief account of Mr. Barry's main points, though I cannot give any adequate outline of the case for them which he so persuadingly presents. At the outset he analyses, after the manner of Lippmann, 'the acids of modernity' which have disintegrated the old sense of security and enthroned confusion. He thinks, and is undoubtedly right, that Lippmann over-estimates the strength of the intellectual solvents, at

* *The Relevance of Christianity.* By the Rev. F. R. Barry, M.A., D.S.O., Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College, and Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford. (Nisbet & Co., Ltd., London. Price 10/6.)

least in the mass of the people; he sees the 'deepest causes of the lost loyalty to the Christian religion in Western Europe . . . in the changed conditions of modern life and the new forms assumed by the social order.' To the ineffectiveness of modern Christianity he is keenly sensitive:

> 'A political party or a social movement which possessed the finest buildings in every district, whole-time agents in every town and village, an experience gained in twelve or thirteen centuries and the appeal of a passionate conviction, would hardly feel that it was making full use of such unique and incomparable resources if it did not count more than we can claim to count in the opinions and actions of the people.'

The forced activities characteristic of the Churches are a psychological compensation by which we try to disguise our lack of effectiveness in the great concerns of the world. Our radical weakness is a *false* other-worldliness which has substituted 'religious experience' (with which about ninety per cent. of the Anglo-Saxon race are unvisited) for God. In this point Mr. Barry would agree with the Barthians. But he is poles apart from them in that he sees that something vastly more real and more difficult is needed to correct the disastrous isolation of modern religion than the Barthian word-play with entities themselves linguistically generated. There is nothing in life which is exempt from the scope of religion or irrelevant to it; but that is not to say that everything ought to be religious. Mr. Barry's fundamental position, which is applied over and over again throughout the book, is that of von Hugel:

> 'No Grace without the substratum, the occasion, the material of Nature; and no Nature without Grace . . . Because, without these not directly religious interests and activities, you, however slowly and unperceivedly, lose the material for Grace to work in and on.'

It is Mr. Barry's splendid consistency to this principle which gives his book the unity which otherwise it would seem to lack, and which explains his omission of much that one would expect to find a place in his exposition of the selected matter. There is no hope for a theology which cuts off religion from the values of this life. Indeed, any such theology simply makes inexplicable the one fact which it must do something to interpret—the existence of this actual world.

The contribution of the New Testament is next expounded. The way in which modern knowledge requires that it should be read and interpreted is set forth with broad sanity and rare insight. The primary mission of early Christianity was not to elaborate a 'social Gospel' nor even an ethic of any kind, but to proclaim the vision of God in Christ. It gave a new background to life. The Christian ethic is not based upon Christ's moral precepts: the belief that it is entails difficulties which are stated with great frankness. The mighty effects of the life of Jesus and the limitations of his actual life are instructively compared with those of St. Francis. The true basis of any claim to finality in Jesus is that he

> 'gives life a new devotion, inspiring men and women throughout history to bring the new scales of valuation, that penetration and delicacy of insight which He alone has made possible, into countless tasks and life-situations of which He had no direct cognizance.'

In refusing to see the problem of the Gospels as an inevitable choice between an ethical or an eschatological outlook, and between the criticism of Harnack or that represented by Sir Edwyn Hoskyns in *The Riddle of the New Testament*, Mr. Barry seems to me to take a line both historically sound and altogether necessary if the doctrine of the Incarnation is to be defended. For in the Gospels there is certainly the same 'tension of unreconciled opposites' which he finds in the rest of the New Testament. It

was needful to emphasise a position which is still far from being recognised as forced upon us by modern New Testament study. But in two points, as it seems to me, Mr. Barry tends to exaggerate a good case which is in no need of that dangerous assistance. Criticism, and drastic criticism, of the 'liberalism' of Harnack is justifiable; but Mr. Barry sometimes uses 'liberalism' in a wider sense, without careful definition, and his contrast between this modern liberalism and what he rightly argues to have been the outlook of Jesus is at times excessive, and tends to land him in positions which he really does not hold. For that 'liberalism' did not arise out of nothing, but arose in a world which, for all its shortcomings, was deeply influenced by the contents of the Gospels, and contained much directly derived from them. So much, indeed, is required by many excellent passages elsewhere in this book. More serious is a dictum like the following:

> 'The whole Messianic category is of His world and not ours, a world frankly as dead as the moon.'

If that statement is pressed, in my judgment it destroys the basis of much that is quite foundational in Mr. Barry's position; for he would then have to depend upon the possibility of an absolute divorce of the reality of intuition and insight from their thought-forms, such as is really never found. 'Experience' or 'intuition,' separated from *all* its thought-form, is but an empty abstraction not an actuality; and the substance cannot be *known* as true if the form be wholly false. I should have thought there is no such thing in the Gospels as 'the *whole* Messianic category.' What there is in them are various and quite inconsistent forms of earlier Messianic expectation lying side by side without any formal reconciliation; but, read in the light of the New Testament (as Mr. Barry so rightly insists that we must read the Gospels), the one thing certain is that the Messianic elements in their Christian setting obviously do not mean what they had meant earlier and outside that setting. In their new environment, which is vastly more important than any one of them, they are not 'as dead as the moon,' and if they were the life-principle of the Incarnation doctrine would be dead also. The Note which Mr. Barry adds to this chapter indicates with his usual frankness that he is not quite happy about the whole of it. The correction of these points would only strengthen the main position for which he ably contends.

The book then proceeds to a discussion of Naturalism and Humanism, and the forcible criticism of Humanism divorced from religion is one of the best things in Mr. Barry's work. Full and generous justice is always done to what is true in Humanism, but it is insisted that, isolated from a supernatural background, its fatal weakness is the same as that already exposed in the Paganism contemporary with the New Testament. It expresses a glorious confidence in man but gives no ultimate ground for believing in him. What is true in Humanism will not 'survive the subsidence of its Christian bases.' To make Man the measure of all things is to destroy faith in Man: such Humanism 'cannot support the weight of its own demands.' But

> 'Christianity, when it is true to its own genius, is able to believe in Man recklessly, despite all that saddens and discourages, because it has seen the vision of God, the eternal source of all worth and wonder —lifting us up to become sons of God.'

The chapter on 'The Redemption of Values' contains, among much other excellent matter, a devastating criticism of the supposed 'absolute values' of goodness, truth and beauty. This hackneyed threefold classification Mr. Barry repudiates as both useless and false: the frontiers do not admit of such delimitation. When the overworked triad are regarded

as objects of three spiritual attitudes, the scientific, the aesthetic, and the ethical, something like the old faculty-psychology is implied. The three are quite obviously interdependent, and what constitutes any of them values is precisely the goodness which they share in common. The part of the discussion entitled 'God's Holiness and Christian Values' is also particularly admirable.

The second part of the book contains four chapters dealing with the Family, Citizenship and its obligations, and the acquisition and use of Wealth. It is impossible to summarise their contents in a way which would be fair or convey a true impression of their excellence. The insight as to what is at stake in the consideration of these matters, the clear facing of issues, the plainness of speech, and the steady exposition of the weakness in clear-cut and one-sided solutions, combine to give a breadth and depth to the treatment the more remarkable by reason of its brevity. The author could do no better than expand these chapters into another book. I would only urge that he should work out more fully the contention that on Christian presuppositions marriage is indissoluble, for I am not sure that he is either consistent or adequate on this point. For me, the root difficulty lies in what Mr. Barry encloses in brackets on p. 234. If marriage is truly the union of two immortal spirits, the remarriage of one partner after the death of the other is hard to justify: yet there are certainly cases where the demands of human need are more binding than any theory. But we cannot leave it at that. If marriage is an affair of this world only, as second marriages would seem to imply, it is quite impossible, on Christian grounds, to maintain that death alone can end marriage, without attaching a significance to death which is sub-Christian. For the Christian, there are other things more destructive than death of all that is good. Christian marriage either is or is not indissoluble; if it is, I cannot see on what grounds (I mean, of course, relevant grounds such as isolated New Testament texts are not), it is dissoluble by death. Of course, in this life, it may be indissoluble so long as it remains Christian; but that is a truism which contributes nothing to the solution of the question.

Needless to say, Mr. Barry insists that the existing divorce law is disgraceful. He might have emphasised that it results in conduct which could not be tolerated in any other department of human conduct without destroying our social life. Christians, he argues, must maintain the highest standards but must make no attempt to enforce them on those who reject their Christian basis. As to the use of contraceptives in marriage, he supports and is inclined to go further than the majority of the Bishops at the last Lambeth Conference, though some will feel that he is a little hesitant in stating the logic of his position. But never is there the least defence of indulgence: everywhere the Christian demand of discipline is maintained, without that non-Christian rigorism which is always destructive of it. I would only add that there are numberless cases in which contraceptives offer no solution at all. Many of the marriages which promise the greatest happiness are those in which each of the partners, by reason of their differences, completes what the other lacks; but these differences often accompany or are rooted in differences of sexual *tempo*. Here discipline alone can avert disaster.

I have said nothing about, and can only call attention to, Mr. Barry's illuminating discussion of such subjects as 'Ethics and the Supernatural,' 'Evolution and the Will of God,' 'The Content of the Will of God,' 'Worship and Christian Ethics.' Throughout he keeps in view the two principles stated early in his volume, namely:—

(1) 'We do Christianity a grave disservice if we identify the cus-

toms and conventions of an age that is now rapidly passing from us with permanent Christian moral principles.'

(2) 'The Christian ethic . . . can never offer men what they want merely at the level of their unredeemed desires. Yet no moral system can approve itself to the free critical judgment of mankind which seems to deny, frustrate or impoverish any essential needs of human personality.'

Mr. Barry's book is by far the best on its subject which has appeared for many a long day. Theoretical moralists may call it slight; but because it always keeps close to the practical business of living, it is more relevant than the more abstractive if longer discussions. I have failed to do it justice. Perhaps in the second edition, which will surely be needed, Mr. Barry will watch his use of the adjectives 'brilliant' and 'desperate,' and their adverbs; will supply the easily ascertainable initials, where at present dashes appear, in his index of authors' names; will check the others; and will not spoil a good point in the quotation from *II Esdras* vii at the front of the book by ending it a verse too soon. J. S. Bezzant.

MULTUM IN PARVO*

This little book is a marvel of compression and comprehension. It is probable that no one else possesses the qualifications for such a sketch in a higher degree than Dr. Bevan. He is proficient in ancient history, as his work on *The House of Seleucus* amply testifies. There is no period of Christian history to which he is a stranger. And although one may discern on almost every page that he is a convinced Christian, yet he has in so marked a degree the qualities of the best historians—balance of judgment, imaginative sympathy, impartiality—that it would be hard to judge from this book to what school or church he belongs.

The book follows successively all the periods of Christian development, both in thought and action, and brings out clearly the original impulse, the elements absorbed from the environment, the tendencies towards domination in philosophy, ethics, and politics. Dr. Bevan's reading, notably of German books, is very wide; he separates in a very unusual degree historic facts from the theories based upon them; he goes back as far as possible to original authorities; and yet, in spite of extreme compression, he gives us a clear and well written narrative, thrown into excellent perspective. I had marked some passages for citation, but, in fact, to select extracts would be an invidious task. Every sentence merits quotation, sets the reader thinking, and gives him some permanent gain.

No book, of course, can escape the defects of its qualities. A learned reader may find statements which he would like to put differently. An ardent adherent of any particular scheme of religion will think that his own views do not get full justice. A hasty reader may glide over the surface not aware of the depths beneath, or he may fail to see the implications involved at every turn. The book needs to be read more than once to be fully appreciated. But this is no more than can be said of the best handbooks in any branch of history.

Dr. Bevan's great achievement is that, working on a minute scale, he succeeds in throwing the history, the schools, the movements of the Christian body into excellent perspective. He is like the ordinance map of England, which on the scale of an inch to the mile succeeds in giving us a clear and accurate view of the whole country. To such a sketch two things are especially necessary: first, that it should be based upon wide observa-

* *Christianity*. By Edwyn Bevan. Home University Library. (Pub. Thornton Butterworth: 1932. Price 2/6.)

tion and study; and, second, that it should be, as far as human nature will permit, objective and impartial. Both of these qualities Dr. Bevan attains. One can trust his statements of fact, and one can equally trust his classifications and corollaries. Of course he is not infallible, but it would, I think, be very difficult to find another brief history of the faith so learned, so accurate and so appreciative. All our modern controversies and developments fall into their place, and nearly all appear as continuations of ways of thought which go back almost or quite to the earliest ages of the faith. Cardinal Newman gives us an account, from his own point of view, of the *logical* development of Christianity; here we have a sketch of its *biological* development. P.G.

ALFRED FAWKES.

All members of the Modern Churchmen's Union will be thankful that these twelve utterances of the late Alfred Fawkes have been collected and published. The author of them was by no means typical of the age in which he lived. He belonged, rather, to that epoch when every educated Englishman was a good European, and a citizen of the world. In a word, he was one born out of due time, and should have lived in the eighteenth century, and preferably as a bishop—a colleague, let us say, of Benjamin Hoadly. In that golden age of enlightenment, before the Evangelical and Tractarian revivals, acting upon panic at the excesses of the French Revolution, had set us back, culturally, for a century. It was because he did not share the insular limitations of the average English clergyman that Fawkes, on his return from Rome, could not regard Anglo-Catholicism seriously. To him, who knew the Continent not as a Cook's tourist but as a good European equally at home in any country, this cult always seemed a trifle Lilliputian, rather like the ridiculous Victorian Gothic architecture with which it was contemporaneous. The efforts of High Church clergymen to ape 'the real thing' amused him; these naïve endeavours of the sheep to imitate the wolf appealed to his recondite sense of humour. He knew post-Tridentine Catholicism from within. His theology was of the Cambridge Platonist order, but he was a friend of Loisy. Fawkes liked to take his higher criticism neat, and not to dilute it with homilectics. Look after the truth and religion will look after itself, was his motto.

His literary style was a combination of eighteenth century dignity and balance with the lightness of touch displayed by Gallic masters such as Renan and Anatole France. He was a Voltairean, and it was always a pleasure to read Fawkes, and still more of a pleasure to hear him. He was an Etonian as well as an alumnus of Balliol. Fawkes, too, perhaps through a continual reading of his Office, had a power of quoting Scripture which the Devil might envy. Joseph Butler, Richard Hooker, and Connop Thirlwall were his favourite divines, but for devotional reading he would often turn to Jane Austen.

The Church a Necessary Evil consists almost entirely of sermons and addresses. Fawkes was at his best, perhaps, in the reviews and articles which he used to write for the *Nation*. His style always betrayed him; the voice, as he would have said, was the voice of Esau. Some may regret the title of this book, but Fawkes himself would certainly have approved the choice. Religious institutions were regarded by him as an evil, though a necessary one. His view was that you never get good or evil undiluted in life, and that you must make the best of things, and try to keep the fools and fanatics from making the worst of them. He was an idealist, but one who diluted his idealism with common sense. 'You cannot have better

**The Church a Necessary Evil.* By the late Alfred Fawkes. With a Memoir by H. D. A. Major, D.D. (Basil Blackwell, 4/6. 1932.)

bread than is made with wheat,' he was fond of saying, yet he was no believer, either, in static and absolutist notions. He agreed with Cardinal Newman: 'To live is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often.' He himself was not afraid to change, nor yet was he afraid upon occasions to remain faithful to the older ways. We may be grateful to Dr. Major for his biographical memoir. It is a well-deserved tribute of a great, good, humble and devout man. 'Say not that the good die.'

For the sake of those readers of the *Modern Churchman,* and it is hoped they will be few, who do not see their way to purchase this book for themselves, we append a few extracts, which are typical of the whole and reflect its sanity, sincerity, humour and wisdom:

'A familiar hymn tells us that

"The Church's one Foundation
Is Jesus Christ her Lord."

There could be no better example of the fallacy of over-statement. Our Lord is the Founder of Christianity; He is not, or is only indirectly, either the Founder of the Church or its Foundation. For the Church is a *corpus mixtum* — a mixed, a very mixed magnitude. The human element bulks large in it; wood, hay, stubble — food for the fire. This is why Tyndale translates the word Church by Congregation; and why our Nineteenth Article defines the Visible Church of Christ as "a congregation of faithful men." Do not think of infallibility in connection with it. Infallibility is a figment of the schools. For is there a Church which has not erred, "not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith"? The mystical Body of Christ is "the blessed company of all faithful people"; but the "glorious Church, not having spot nor wrinkle," is in heaven, not here. Here and now, as soon as we have said the word "Church" we have got outside the Gospel, and are up against something foreign and hostile to it. "My Kingdom" (said Christ) "is not of this world": that of the Church is.'

Again: 'We are accustomed to think of the Incarnation as a fact or belief transcending human reason, and standing outside the natural order. If, by the Incarnation, we mean the fully developed doctrine of the Œcumenical Councils, this no doubt is so. But there is another method of approach in which history, not dogma, is the point of departure. Here that element of human opinion and will which (Marcellus of Ancyra tells us) is inseparable from the notion of dogma is avoided; we begin with what we know. We sift the evidence of the New Testament; accept its accentuation of Christ's manhood; and only then ask ourselves whether and in what sense he is God. Thus envisaged, the Incarnation comes to us not like a light flashed on the darkness of this mysterious universe in which we find ourselves, but by very contrast making its darkness darker yet, but like a gentle ray proportioned to our imperfect vision. It shows us God as near and friendly, and exhibits the world not as the theatre of the incalculable and disconnected, but as a rational order, fitted to be the home of the rational creature, man.'

Once more: 'He was born of a human mother; He made glad a human home. He was the most human of men; His instinctive Nature-sense; His sympathy with his fellows — men, women and children; His disregard of the merely conventional; His indignation at oppression and falsehood—all marked an exceptionally broad and deep humanity. To the prudential virtues, then, as now, dear to the religious world, He was a stranger. The material side of life meant little to Him; He was indifferent to public opinion, and contemptuous of cant. He did not balance His statements; He was no respecter of persons; He was intolerant of pietism and pietists; He

put the publican before the Pharisee, the woman who was a sinner before her accusers; the Samaritan before the priest. Of orthodoxy, and in general of the formal element in religion, He made little. He ignored the Temple worship; He made no secret of His scorn for the trivialities and casuistry of the current legalism; He taught "not as the scribes." He had never a trace of the professional moralist or the theologian. His sayings were upwellings of life, not premises of a syllogism . . . His ministry was one long conflict—not with sinners; with sinners He was infinitely patient—but with those who held themselves, and were held by the world, to be righteous:

"the meanly wise, the feebly good."

For a time they conquered.'

And lastly: 'We should do well to read and re-read what is probably the greatest of English sermons, that of Bishop Butler "On the Ignorance of Man." It has been said that it should be preached yearly before the British Association, at the Church Congress, and in other places where the Ignorance of Man is accustomed to assert itself. This is perhaps a little hard upon the British Association, whose object is the advancement of knowledge. But the knowledge of to-day is outpassed by that of to-morrow: "The feet of them that buried thy husband are at the door, and they shall carry thee out." We are slow to recognise the essential flux of thought and things. Life is a process; a thing always becoming, never become . . . This is as true in spiritual as in secular life; of creeds and confessions of faith as of scientific hypotheses. All have a time and place element: all are, as it were, thrown out against something huge, undefined, limitless—the presence of which we rather divine than see, and of which we are rather conscious than cognizant. This is why the wise distrust hierarchies.'

J. C. HARDWICK.

CROCKFORD*

It has become almost impertinent to commend the standard, as it has long been unnecessary to emphasise the value, of this annual production, 'being a statistical book of reference for facts relating to the Clergy and the Church; with supplement and full index of facts relating to the parishes and benefices of England and Wales and Ireland, and to the Charges, Missions, etc., of Scotland, India and the Colonies, and of Europe, Asia, Africa and South America.' The present issue contains no new features and lacks none of the merits of its recent predecessors. It is safe to say that no other annual volume is of comparable usefulness to the whole Anglican Communion. We would only repeat the suggestion that some indication should be given—it could be done by a single letter—as to whom of the Clergy are married.

The Preface, in keeping with the spirit of the motto on the title-page, is always a valuable Commentary on current affairs of the Church, and this year it contains a full measure of the sanity of the Church of England at its best. There is much speculation as to the author's identity. Whoever he may be, he should lay it upon his conscience that his voice and accents are not more frequently heard in ecclesiastical affairs. His style this year is even better than usual. After recording the more important appointments throughout the year, he discusses, among other topics, Tithe Rent-charge, The Pensions' Board, The Staffing of Parishes, The Financial Burdens of the Clergy, and The Church Assembly. We append a few quotations:

'We read, and can well believe, that "the question of determining income and value has been and remains one of the greatest difficulties"

* *Crockford's Clerical Directory*, 1932. Sixty-first Issue. (Oxford University Press. Price 42/-.)

(this with reference to contributions under the Pensions Measure). We would respectfully point out that the task would be considerably simplified if all contributors paid the same amount. As they will all ultimately receive the same pension, common sense and equity both point in this direction. The arrangement would probably make it possible to reduce the office staff by approximately one-half.'

As for the number of those ordained,

'The "peak year" appears to have been 1885, when 870 deacons were ordained . . . It is curious that the rapid increase of the episcopate should have been followed closely by a diminution in the number of men willing to devote their lives to the Ministry, and that the two processes should (roughly) have kept pace ever since. Including Bishops-Suffragan the English episcopate is more than double what it was fifty years ago, while the number of candidates for Holy Orders has diminished by nearly one-half . . .

'As the clergy are supposed to be generally ambitious of high office, it may be worth while to point out that the ordination candidate of to-day has at least three times as good a chance of becoming a Bishop as was enjoyed by his predecessor of half a century ago. We would respectfully suggest that schoolmasters should call the attention of boys and parents to this interesting, and we fancy unsuspected, fact.'

Apropos the clergymen of country parishes being insufficiently occupied:

'If it be desirable that behind every hour of visible activity should be at least two of prayer, reading, and reflection, if learning is considered to be of any value, if the clergy ought to be men of God rather than men of affairs, then plenty to do can be found anywhere. The smallest rural parish might become a nursing-mother of saints.'

The Preface also recalls the remark of Archbishop Tait that 'the modern ideal of a Bishop appeared to be a man in a chronic state of perspiration.' There can be little doubt that the first Bishop of acknowledged eminence who will publicly declare that he finds the endless meetings in London to be largely a waste of time and a hindrance to his more important work, and that he intends to cut half of them out, will set a good example to his brethren and help the Church. We append two more extracts:

'The principal business of the Summer Session (Church Assembly) was, as usual, the Budget . . . A proposal to increase the allowance to the Missionary Council by £300 was rejected.

'The Council's spokesman upheld the best traditions of every Government Department since Government in the modern sense became known to the world. "The volume of business had increased considerably, owing to the zeal and ability of those whom it would ill become him to particularise. There must be an ample staff to transact it, who must be adequately paid. Economy in the office would be false economy. Expenditure in the office would justify itself over and over again in the long run," etc., etc.'

'The Assembly was unmoved by these powerful arguments.'

'Despite the Lateran Treaty, the relations between Italy and the Vatican have not been entirely easy. Given two autocrats, neither of whom seems to lack self-confidence nor to dislike publicity, with no more than the Tiber between them, difficulties are not unlikely to arise.'

It would be an excellent thing to publish the Preface in pamphlet form. The necessary modifications would be negligible. J.S.B.

A WELCOME REPRINT*

This cheap reprint of the late Maurice Pryke's exposition of Modernist Christianity as a working religion is indeed welcome. There is included a short memoir of the author, reprinted from the *Modern Churchman*. Modern Churchmen will do well to purchase this book, both for the purpose of reading it themselves and of lending or giving it to others. The word propaganda, since the war, when propaganda was equivalent to organised mendacity, has become somewhat discredited. But there is an honourable propaganda, as legitimate as it is necessary. The Truth must be disseminated. The late Maurice Pryke's book contains the right sort of propaganda, and those who agree with his point of view should buy a number of copies of it and distribute them. A dozen copies would cost less than a pound, and it would be difficult to find a more useful way of spending that amount of money. This book will strongly appeal to all who seek a rational basis for a living religion. J.C.H.

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR, THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES AND REUNION.

I have read with much pleasure and warm appreciation the last paragraph on page 530 of your January number. It describes the situation, as we see it here, with precise accuracy. It would, I feel sure, be hard to find a single Englishman here, Protestant or Catholic, who would not endorse it.

The humbug that is talked from Anglican platforms and pulpits and written in Anglican journals about 'union' with the Orthodox Churches (I am glad you recognise that the word should be plural) receive no support from my countrymen in this country. The movement is far more political than religious in its inspiration and objects, and those simple Anglican clergy who play with it need to be reminded of the words of its High Priest, Canon Douglas, who, in a transient mood of frank realism, once admitted that 'humanly speaking, as the Anglican Church is to-day, and as the Orthodox Church is to-day, their union is not within the region of practicality.'

As Dr. Carnegie Simpson well said at Birmingham last year: 'It is not unjust or uncharitable to say that union with the Orthodox Eastern Churches would hardly at all affect the work of the evangelisation of the world, and would contribute little or nothing to the solution of the problems of Christian life and thought with which we have to deal.'

I should add that there is a very marked revival movement in the Greek Church here, which owes much of its inspiration and its methods to the despised Greek Evangelicals, whose numbers and influence are much underrated—for obvious reasons—by official Orthodox circles. This revival is mainly a youth movement, but is one which includes many earnest and devout Orthodox Greeks to whom association with the more progressive element in the Anglican Communion would prove a helpful source of strength and encouragement.

A BRITISH OFFICIAL IN GREECE.

CORRIGENDA.

P. 585, l. 3.—The Latin quotation should be: *Vir nulla non donandus lauru.*

P. 635.—The quotation which concludes the review is from Browning's *Andrea del Sarto.*

ED., M.C.

**Modernism as a Working Faith.* By the late W. Maurice Pryke, B.D. Cheap Edition. (Heffer, 1/6. 1932.)